

THE  
ECLECTIC REVIEW,

For MAY 1829.

- Art. I. 1. *Mahometanism Unveiled: an Inquiry, in which that Arch-Heresy, its Diffusion and Continuance, are examined on a new Principle, tending to confirm the Evidences, and aid the Propagation of the Christian Faith.* By the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D. Chancellor of Ardfert, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Limerick. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. xlviii. 954. Price 24s. London, 1829.
2. *The Mohammedan System of Theology: a Compendious Survey of the History and Doctrines of Islamism, contrasted with Christianity, together with Remarks on the Prophecies relative to its Dissolution.* By the Rev. W. H. Neale, A.M., Chaplain of the County Bridewell, Gosport, Hants. 8vo. pp. 252. London, 1828.

IT will be one very beneficial result of the 'study of prophecy', which has of late been pursued with so much more ardour than success, should it lead to the more diligent and religious study of the unsealed volume of Divine Providence—history. In our last number, we had occasion to advert to the very inadequate cultivation which has hitherto been bestowed upon this important branch of Christian knowledge, and to the essentially defective character of our leading historical works. The charge which has been justly brought against our moral philosophers, is not less applicable to our historians; that they 'place 'the religion of Christ in the relation of a diminutive satellite 'to the world of moral and eternal interests.'\* The very terms,

\* Foster's Essays, p. 427. 'When I mention our historians', remarks this truly philosophic Writer, 'it will instantly occur to you, that the very foremost names in the department, imply every thing that is deadly to the Christian religion itself as a Divine communication, and therefore lie under a condemnation of a different kind. But as to the generality of those who have not been regarded as enemies to the Christian cause, have they not forgotten what was due from its friends?' The Author proceeds to point out the anti-Christian spirit

sacred and polite, as applied to literature, and intended to comprehend its whole range, indicate that history, the most important material of both, has not been regarded in its true light, since neither of these generic appellations will properly describe what it ought to be. It cannot obviously be included under sacred literature, the province of the theologian; and with still less propriety can it be regarded as a mere branch of polite study, the pursuit of the scholar and man of letters, without lowering its importance and vitiating its character. We lay no stress upon such terms of classification, except as they serve to perpetuate false distinctions, which have a positive influence on the minds of authors as well as of readers, determining the specific aim of the one, and the choice of reading made by the other. History is a serious thing. To speak of it as instructive, as the apt vehicle of moral and political lessons, as fraught with useful information, is not to describe its real character or importance. All this, a fable or a poem might be. But, viewed as the exhibition of moral agency, under the awful predicament in which mankind are placed,—as the development of our nature in all its power and weakness, in connexion with the progress of a moral conflict,—the working together of opposing secondary causes in subserviency to the Supreme and Final Cause of all things,—every section of human history is pregnant with awful interest.

To this view of the subject we were led to advert, in noticing Mr. Bowdler's edition of Gibbon's "*Decline and Fall*"; and we intimated our intention to support it in future articles. We proceed to redeem our promise, happy to avail ourselves of the occasion afforded by the masterly production now before us. Of all the events in modern history, the rise, triumph, and perpetuation of the Mohammedan heresy, form incomparably the most remarkable, not excepting the fall of the Roman empire itself.

It is the remark of Dr. Johnson, cited by Mr. Forster, that 'there are two objects of curiosity,—the Christian world and the Mahometan world: all the rest may be considered as barbarous'. We cannot subscribe to either position: the latter requires to be greatly qualified in order to be correct; and what is barbarous, is not less an object of enlightened curiosity, than all

---

and tendency of those false estimates of character, and those awards of approbation to the world's heroes, which exclude all reference to the decisions of the Final Judge. The irreligious principles upon which history has generally been written, are, however, evinced, not simply by the false estimates of character which it sanctions, in opposition to the Divine law, but by an atheistic representation of the events, in exclusion of the Divine providence.

that is polished in civilization. But we fully agree with the Author of "*Mahometanism Unveiled*", that, as the success of the Arabian imposture is the only event in the history of the human species, which admits of comparison with the propagation of Christianity, so, the causes of that success have never yet received an adequate solution. In fact, the attempt to account for it by a concurrence of merely secondary causes, he justly remarks, is not less unsound and unphilosophical, and scarcely less irreligious, than to assign, as Gibbon does, such causes, as explaining the rapid growth and triumph of Christianity itself. Yet, the Christian advocate 'has condescended to assail the 'pretensions of the Koran with the identical missiles unsuccessfuly launched by the infidel against the claims of the Gospel'. 'Qualify it as men may', Mr. Forster observes, 'the foundation of this argument is unavoidably laid in the exclusion of 'the superintendence of a special, and even an ordinary providence.' Supposing those secondary human causes to be fairly adduced, their existence and concurrence would still remain to be accounted for by a primary cause. They form, in fact, a main part of the phenomena which they are employed to explain. But, in the case of the Mohammedan religion, the usual explanation proceeds upon a mistaken view of the facts; and, as to the main difficulty, it does not even cut the knot.

'In the general conduct of the controversy respecting the success of Mahomet, the infidel and the believer have hitherto taken diametrically opposite lines. The object of the former has been, by every artifice of exaggeration, to exalt the case of the Koran to an equality with that of the Gospel: that of the latter, to sink the pretensions of Mahometanism below all comparison with the claims of Christianity. The inevitable results of extremes on both sides are legible, in a fruitful growth of undesigned misconceptions, or intentional misrepresentations. This state of the question cannot but be hurtful to dispassionate inquirers, to minds that love fairness, and even to the cause of truth itself. . . . While the Christian has no reasonable grounds of doubt or fear to withhold him from doing the fullest justice to the phenomena of Mahometanism, the phenomena themselves are singularly interesting and mysterious. The origin and rise of the heresy, its rapid and wide diffusion, with the whole train of circumstances attending its first promulgation, are extraordinary facts. Its dominion over the human mind, and power, both as conquering and as conquered, to change the characters of nations, are facts still more extraordinary. Its progress, in quarters where it resorted only to the arts of peace and persuasion, is unexplained. Its permanency and inviolable preservation of its original pure theism, are inexplicable on any ordinary grounds of reason or analogy. While, by the mysterious concurrence, unexampled save in the history of Christianity itself, of causes and events conducing to favour its introduction and establishment, the mind is naturally led to seek the explanation in the only adequate source; the



interposition, for some wise and gracious, though inscrutable end, of the special and superintending providence of God.'—Forster, vol. I. p. 66—8.

The inquiry is of the deepest importance, and nothing can be more admirable than the temper and spirit in which it is entered upon by the present Author. The candour and fairness with which the difficulties of the question are stated, must leave a very favourable impression on every intelligent reader, and will prepare him to find the subject treated in both a competent and an original manner. Nor will he be disappointed. The 'Arch-heresy' is not only examined on a new principle, but is placed altogether in a new and very striking light; and the novelty which the Author has succeeded in imparting to a subject which may hitherto have been deemed trite and exhausted, does not result from any fanciful theory or learned paradox. The utmost sobriety of judgement is maintained throughout the investigation; and the Author's views and statements are supported by a mass of information in itself highly interesting and valuable. Many of the collateral inquiries into which the subject branches out, are scarcely less important than the original and main question. The illustrations of Scripture Prophecy, the prophetic parallel between Mohammedism\* and Popery, and the historical analogy between the three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedism, will more especially command attention; and the reader will probably be not a little startled at the closeness of the resemblance, and the numerous points of correspondence, between the true and the spurious faith. The work is altogether a valuable contribution to theological literature, while it throws no small light upon general history; and it is not merely the best work that has hitherto appeared upon the subject, (for, with the exception of Sale's Introduction to the Koran, and Mr. Mills's "History of Muhammedanism", there has been nothing in the English language that can be called good,) but it is the only one in which anything like justice has been done to the inquiry. Our readers will reasonably expect a somewhat extended analysis of such a publication; but we can take only a rapid view of the variety of detail included in the contents.

In the introductory chapter, from which the preceding extract has been taken, the Author, after pointing out the mis-

---

\* Mr. Forster, we regret to notice, has given his sanction to an orthography which we had thought nearly exploded. Among the various ways of writing the name of the Arabian, Mahomet is the least proper; and it has been copied from the worst of all authorities in the spelling of foreign names, the French. But *Mahometanism* is barbarous. Gibbon has more properly *Mahometism*.



taken estimates and unfair argumentation of preceding writers, announces, in the following terms, the principle upon which he proposes to conduct the investigation.

‘The basis of the present argument is laid in the existence of a prophetic promise to Abraham in behalf of his sons Isaac and Ishmael. By the terms of this promise, a blessing is annexed to the posterity of each; and on Ishmael, as well as on Isaac, this blessing is pronounced, because he was Abraham’s seed, and as a special mark of the Divine favour. . . . . According to the original promise concerning each, Isaac and Ishmael were severally to become the fathers of great nations; and the history of these nations was also to be signally connected with the history and fortunes of mankind. The Jews were the prophetic offspring of the blessing to the younger; the Arabians, of that to the elder son. The promise to Isaac had, in point of fact, first, a temporal fulfilment in the establishment of his race in Canaan; and secondly, a spiritual fulfilment in the advent of the Messiah, Jesus Christ, and in the establishment of Christianity throughout the world. In the promise to Ishmael, from the literal correspondence of the terms, coupled with the peculiar circumstances under which it was made, there seems to be just reason to look for an analogous double fulfilment. But the history of the Arabians, from the remotest antiquity down to the seventh century of the Christian era, affords no shadow of a parallel. At this advanced point of time, a full and exact parallel is presented, in the appearance of Mahomet; and in the establishment, through his instrumentality, by the descendants of Ishmael, first of a temporal, and secondly, of a spiritual dominion over a vast portion of the world. Here, in point of fact, there obtains a parallelism of accomplishment, in perfect accordance with the verbal parallelism which subsists between the two branches of the original promise. And the matter comes shortly to this plain issue: that either the promise to Ishmael has had *no* fulfilment analogous with that made to Isaac, with which it yet so singularly corresponds; or it has found its fulfilment, as the facts of the case so strongly indicate, in the rise and success of Mahomet, and in the temporal and spiritual establishment of the Mahometan superstition.’ Vol. I. pp. 87—89.

The first section of the work is devoted to a comparative analysis of the two-fold covenant with Abraham, made in behalf of his sons Isaac and Ishmael. In point of temporal prosperity, the promise to the latter seems to preponderate. To him alone is given the specific declaration: “And I will make of thee a great nation”; and in his seed alone, the promise has been realized. The Jewish monarchy was, at one time, a powerful state, but the posterity of Isaac have never been characteristically a great nation. The grand and peculiar feature in the promise concerning Isaac, was, that in his offspring all the nations of the earth should be blessed; a promise denoting a mysterious fulfilment, and realized in the advent and spiritual reign of the Messiah. Christianity is allowed, on all hands, to

be the accomplishment of the latter prediction; and Mohammedism bears ample marks of being the only assignable fulfilment of the former.

Having thus laid open the basis of the analogy upon which the general argument of the Inquiry rests, and which forms the ground-work of the historic parallel, the Author proceeds, in the next two sections, to consider the place which Mohammed and his religion appear to occupy in prophecy. The rank which it holds in the providential history of the world, cannot fail, he remarks, to present itself in a very forcible light, when it shall be seen, that this is the only spiritual domination which shares with Christianity the distinction of being marked out by Prophecy. The vision of Daniel concerning the little horn of the Macedonian Goat, is first viewed in application to Mohammedism; an interpretation of the prophecy which is defended with great ability in an article thrown into the Appendix. The Author does not deny, that the prediction may have had a primary relation to Antiochus, agreeably to the belief of the ancient Church, both Jewish and Christian; but he contends for 'a germinant interpretation' which admits of its successive application to Antiochus, the Romans, and Mohammedism. We must confess that this 'fundamental rule' appears to us a very unsound and dangerous one, since, upon this principle, it is impossible to know when any prediction is fulfilled, or to how many similar events, yet future, it may become successively applicable. We can admit of a primary and an ultimate fulfilment; but, in such cases, while there is a designed correspondence between the two events, they are of so different an order as to justify our attributing to the prediction a lower and a higher sense; and the design of the first and more literal accomplishment seems to be, to establish the certainty of the ultimate fulfilment. But the power of the Syro-Macedonian king, the Roman power, and the rise of Mohammedism, are all three events of the same order; that is to say, simply political events, and the latter two of equal magnitude and importance. If Mohammed be intended, we must conclude, that neither pagan nor papal Rome can be included in the prediction. If, 'in its principal sense', as the Author contends, the Romans cannot be the power intended by the type of the little horn, it can be in *no* sense applicable to them. The pretensions of Antiochus, he remarks, seem to be now generally given up: the arguments brought against that theory of application by Sir Isaac Newton and Bishop Newton, are, he thinks, conclusive. It forms, indeed, a very strong objection, that Epiphanes, instead of proceeding out of one of the four horns or monarchies, was himself one of the four horns of the Macedonian Goat. The Author of the Book of Maccabees, seems to



allude to the prophecy as fulfilled in the person of the Syrian monarch; but if such was his design, it is singular that he should not point out the verification of the prediction. Such an allusion, if intended, would seem to be more by way of an elegant accommodation, as in some of the citations from the prophetic writings made by the New Testament writers. The case would, indeed, be stronger, were we to suppose the coincidence between the language of the narrative and the prediction undesigned, as that would imply an actual correspondence, to a certain degree, between the prediction and the fact; whereas if the Historian had the prophecy in his mind, this only proves his opinion to have been in favour of such correspondence; and the mere opinion of an uninspired writer is not evidence. The application of the 'little horn' to Mohammedism, is not unattended with difficulties, but these, it must be admitted, the Author has very ably met. For his arguments in support of this application of the prediction, we must refer our readers to the work itself. The points of correspondence between the typical horn and the supposed antitype, are thus summed up.

'The littleness of its beginnings; the rapidity of its growth, and the vastness of its expansion in the directions foretold; the genuineness of its anti-Christian character; the clearness of its correspondence to the terms employed throughout the prophecy, which are chiefly borrowed from the Jewish ritual, and manifestly designed to describe a spiritual tyranny; the strong resemblance, lastly, between the prophetic descriptions of the two little horns, coupled with the not less perfect similarity, in fact, subsisting between Mahometanism and the papacy;—these features together identify the Mahometan apostacy with the power of the eastern little horn, at once with a minuteness and a comprehensiveness which, in any application of the type to the Romans, would be sought after in vain.' Vol. II. p. 440.

In the third section, Mr. Forster proceeds to connect the prophetic vision of Daniel with the strictly parallel, but ampler and clearer predictions relating to Mohammedism, contained in the Apocalypse. With regard to the prophetic representations of the Saracenic locusts and the Euphratean or Turkish horsemen, in the ninth chapter, there is no room for a difference of opinion. Infidelity itself must be staggered by the exact and circumstantial coincidence between the prediction and its accomplishment, which is in itself sufficient to attest the inspiration of the book. In the Bedoween romance of Antar, a genuine production of the muse of Arabia, the locust is introduced as the national emblem of the Ishmaelites; and the exquisite propriety of the symbol is not more remarkable, than the nature, term, and limitation of the predicted devastation.

'Contrary to the peculiar office of desolation proper to the natural



locust, the symbolic locusts of the Apocalypse had it especially in commandment, "that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree". The very singularity of these prohibitions, their apparent paradox, has served, in the event, to demonstrate the fact of the accomplishment. The famous injunction of the Caliph Abubeker to Yezid, the commander in the Syrian expedition, the *first* undertaking of the Saracens in the way of foreign conquest, forms such a commentary on this text of Scripture, as the hand and power of an over-ruling Providence only could supply: "Destroy not palm-trees", writes this Caliph, "cut down no fruit-trees, nor burn any fields of corn". Vol. I. pp. 219, 220.

The period assigned for the power of the locusts in this prophecy, is "five months"; a term which remarkably represents at once the actual duration of the natural plague here alluded to, and the conquering era of the Saracenic empire. Computing from the first appearance of Mohammed to the foundation of Bagdad, from which time that empire became stationary, that period extends precisely over five prophetic months, or one hundred and fifty years. The second period of the prophecy is scarcely less vividly portrayed. The plague of the locusts ceases with the fifth trumpet: the sounding of the sixth introduces the more deadly pestilence of the Euphratean horsemen. The close connexion indicated between these trumpets, and between the two-fold desolation which they prefigure, is correctly in accordance with historical fact.

'Bagdad was taken, and a final period put to the temporal supremacy of the Caliphs, by Togrul Bey, A.D. 1055. Ten years after, the Turks, under his successor, Alp Arslan, crossed the Euphrates, and, by the permanent conquest of the Roman provinces of Armenia and Georgia, finally established themselves within the Greek empire. Both these conquests were completed about the year 1068. And, from this last date to that of the taking of Constantinople, the interval of time tallies, to a day, with the period allotted by the prophecy, for the course of the Euphratean horsemen.' Vol. I. p. 221.

An hour, a day, a month, and a year, in prophetic language, amount to 391 lunar years and 15 days, or 385 Gregorian years; which will bring us down to A.D. 1453, when the Greek empire was finally destroyed by the fall of Constantinople. The change in the national religion of the Turks, which preceded their trans-euphratean conquests, is not the least remarkable link in the chain of events. 'Togrul Bey', observes Mr. Sharon Turner, (in a passage cited by Mr. Forster,) 'produced or admitted a revolution . . . . momentous to the mind and fortunes of mankind. Under his reign, the great Turkish nation adopted the religion of Mohammed; and professing it with all the energy of their native character, and all the zeal of recent

'converts, they became its fierce champions *at that precise era when it was losing its hold on the human intellect*, and, but for the support of their simple, rude, uncriticising, credulous, and vehement spirit, *might have quietly expired*.'

Mr. Forster next proceeds to analyse the prophetic vision in the thirteenth chapter of the Apocalypse, considering the second beast as denoting the Mohammedan apostasy. It is, he remarks, an interesting fact, that the vision of the second beast was universally understood of Mohammed and Mohammedism in the age of Roger Bacon. The first beast arose up out of the sea; the second out of the earth. That is, remarks our Author, 'in other words, the former arose in the West; the latter in the East.'

'By the Jews, in their common parlance, Asia, as contradistinguished from Europe, was denominated the earth; and Europe, as contradistinguished from Asia, the sea; a fact which appears from Scripture itself, where Europe is spoken of by the title of "the Isles of the Sea". The distinct locations thus allotted to the two beasts by the terms of the prophecy, accordingly, have not passed unnoticed. "The Apostle", observes a learned writer of our own day (Dr. Hales), "was stationed on the sea-shore to view these wild beasts. The first rose from the sea, or westward, as he looked from the Isle of Patmos towards Europe. The second rose from the earth, or the east, as he looked towards Asia." Now those interpreters who understand the power of the second beast to be reducible to some modification only of the power of the first, inevitably take away this local distinctness, and in one form or other confound the two beasts together. But, as the writer just cited well subjoins, "they are clearly distinct; and their temporal and ecclesiastical powers, though acting in conjunction in the business of persecuting the two witnesses, ought not to be confounded."

'The prophetic terms of "the earth" and "the sea", may be curiously illustrated, conformably with this application, from a Turkish adage, which directly identifies the beast that came up out of the sea, with the Franks or Latin Christians of Europe; and the beast which came up out of the earth, with the Mahometan powers. "The Turks," says Mr. Gibbon, "themselves acknowledge, that if God had given them THE EARTH, he had left THE SEA to the infidels." The vision of the two beasts, therefore, interpreted as applying to Romanism and Mahometanism, characterizes the powers symbolized, with *geographical* discrimination.'—Vol. I. p. 229—234.

The second beast 'had two horns like a lamb,'—a semblance which marks its character as an Anti-Christ or false religion. Its voice was that of a dragon, to denote its real nature to be a political tyranny. Thus far, all is clear. But, in the exposition of the ensuing verses, there occurs considerable difficulty; and we cannot say that our Author has satisfactorily cleared up the obscurity in which their meaning is involved. Moham-

medism, he remarks, 'verified the prophecy, by setting up an 'antichristian tyranny, the counterpart or image of popery, yet, 'at the same time wholly independent of it, and having a life 'and power of its own.' This may be a correct statement of the general sense; but verses 12—15 involve difficulties which all the Author's ingenuity has been insufficient to remove.

With regard to the *name* of the second beast, Mr. Forster remarks, that so many solutions of the numerical enigma have been proposed, that little weight can be attached to any of them. He considers it, however, as deserving of notice, that 'the name of Mahomet, as written in the idiom of the Apocalyptic by the Byzantine historians, accurately returns the prophetic number 666.' The oriental practice of forming dates into words, renders it highly probable that a date is intended, although that date may at the same time be expressed in a real name. Roger Bacon, towards the close of the thirteenth century, interpreted it as indicating the appointed term of the Mohammedan apostacy. The event disproved his calculation, but his mode of interpretation may be nevertheless correct.

We pass over the Author's accommodation of our Lord's prediction in Matt. xxiv. 23., to the person and 'lying pretensions' of Mohammed: it is ingenious, but, we are persuaded, unsubstantial. With regard to the period of duration assigned to the two beasts, Mr. Forster adopts the opinion of Dr. Hales and others, that as their rise was coetaneous, and as both arrived at their meridian grandeur about A.D. 1300, since which they have gradually declined together, so, 'they will probably set together in that abyss from which they rose.'

'Holding it, however, for a fundamental principle, arising out of the very nature and end of prophecy, that the times and seasons indicated in the prophetic scriptures must have reached their accomplishment before they can be fully known, the present writer is neither desirous to affirm the conclusions of others respecting those mysterious dates, nor to advance conclusions of his own. Merely as a conjecture, illustrative of preceding conjectures on the chronology of these prophecies, he would, however, venture to suggest the possibility, that the era of the *Hejra*, according to Mahometans themselves unquestionably the measure of Mahometan dominion, may also be that of Saint John's twelve hundred and sixty days. On this supposition, "the time of the end" must synchronize with A.H. 1260\*. Even thus much the Author would hesitate to conjecture, did he conceive the "time of the end" necessarily to include more than the general *political* downfall of Mahometanism. The *political* rise of this power entered largely into Daniel's description of that prophetic period in

---

\* We are now in A. H. 1244, which will terminate on the 2d of July.



the commencement ; its *political extinction*, therefore, may well occupy a prominent place in his description of the close. That this downfall, though silently, yet surely, draws near the predicted consummation, may be inferred from past events. Since the middle of the seventeenth century, the empire of the Crescent has been everywhere on the wane. The era of Turkish conquest ended with the second failure before Vienna ; and the Ottoman, once the scourge and terror, has long been the contempt of Christendom. Persia, again, torn by internal dissensions, had sunk into insignificance at a still earlier period ; and her fitful blaze of conquest under Nadir Shah, served but to hasten the overthrow of the third great Mahometan power, the Mogul empire in India. From this joint view, therefore, of prophecy and history there seems a strong probability, that we draw near to "the time of the end."—Vol. I. pp. 271, 2.

The 'Historical Analogy of Mahometanism with Judaism 'and Christianity', is the subject of the next section. This is illustrated by a tabular view, first of the studied agreements and undesigned coincidences between Moses, our Lord, and Mohammed, and secondly, by a similar tabular parallel between the three religions. We must make room for the 'recapitulation' subjoined to the first table.

'To bring under a compendious separate view, in the first instance, the parallel between Moses and Mahomet, exposed in the preceding table, the reader will observe, that both descended originally from the same stock of Abraham : both entered on the prophetic office at the same age of forty : the Arabian desert was the common scene of their ministry : there, the one first received his genuine, and the other first contrived his spurious, revelation : there, also, the one composed the Pentateuch, the other the Koran : Moses received the tables of the law, Mahomet professed to receive the chapters of the Koran, directly from heaven, and written by the finger of God : the former, by divine commandment, deposited the tables of his law, the latter, avowedly after his example, the chapters of his Koran, in an ark or coffer of wood : the Pentateuch was given by the one, as containing a complete civil and ecclesiastical polity for the Jews : the Koran by the other, as containing a complete civil and ecclesiastical polity for the Saracens : both sent forth their kindred people, the Israelites and the Ishmaelites, from the same deserts, with the same objects professedly in view, namely, to conquer and to colonize ; and, where they settled, there to set up and establish their exclusive religions : both died, in Arabia, before their respective followers issued forth from the desert : both, by their immediate successors, Joshua and Omar, subdued Palestine : both, prior to entering on their missions, were driven into exile in the Arabian desert : both, from obscure life, attained to the sovereignty over their respective people : both did so, by offering themselves to their countrymen as prophets sent of God : both became legislators as well as princely rulers : both were, at once, temporal and spiritual lawgivers : Moses declared himself to be the type of the Messiah ; Mahomet claimed to be the antitype fore-shewn by Moses : both qualified for the prophetic office by the same

means,—a retirement of many years in the desert: both appointed under them twelve apostles or messengers, and seventy elders or companions: Moses, in the Mount, talked with God; Mahomet pretended to have conversed with God in heaven, as Moses had done in the Mount: Christ excepted, these were the only persons who laid claim to this distinction: both were, at the first, rejected by their own people, and resisted by their own families, with signal contempt and contumely: each, eventually, erected a durable dominion, and a religion which continues to the present day: the one recovered the Israelites, the other the Ishmaelites, from idol-worship; they alike restored, more or less perfectly, the patriarchal doctrine of one God; and alike enjoined and effected the extirpation of idolatry by the secular sword. Mahomet, in fine, performed all this, professing himself to be “a prophet like unto Moses”, and to be sent of God to restore the religion of Abraham, their common father.

‘Many of the resemblances in this parallel, we have said, were studied imitations: the fact is of high importance in the present argument; for every such mark of imitation of the great type of Christ, is a mark of antichrist, and contributes to determine the place of Mahomet as his chief eastern head. Many of its agreements, on the other hand, arose without design, and without the possibility of being classed as imitations.’ Vol. I. pp. 291—293.

‘The historical parallel of Mahomet with Christ Jesus is, as we are authorized by the nature of the relation to anticipate, perhaps still more peculiar and exact. This false Messiah, like the true, was of the stock of Abraham; Christ, by Judah, one of the younger sons of Israel; Mahomet, by Kedar, one of the younger sons of Ishmael: both were of royal origin; but of humble immediate parentage: both were foretold by corresponding symbols; Christ as a star, Mahomet as a falling star: a new star, rising in Arabia, preceded and proclaimed the nativity; a fiery comet, rising also in Arabia, is said to have ushered in the birth of Mahomet: the preternatural darkness at the death of Christ was the prelude to the publication of the Gospel beyond Judea; an eclipse of the sun, of extraordinary degree and duration, is stated to have taken place, when Mahomet first proclaimed his creed beyond Arabia, and invited foreign states to embrace it: the same title, *Evangelist*, is applied to the true Messiah in the Bible, and to the Arabian impostor in the Koran: Christ, in the one, is styled “the Apostle of our profession;” Mahomet, in the other, “the Apostle of God:” the angel Gabriel, in the former, appears as the annunciator of Christ’s birth and mission; in the latter, is fabled to appear as the messenger of God revealing his pretended mission to Mahomet: in the flight into Egypt, and in the Hejra, or flight to Medina, the number of persons the same: the true Messiah was rejected by the Jews, but received by the Samaritans: the counterfeit Messiah was rejected by the Ishmaelites of Mecca, and received by the Joktanites of Medina: the true Messiah became the founder of a perpetual religion, and a dominion not of this world connected with it: this spurious Messiah became the founder of a durable religion, and a dominion of this world connected with it: both, by their countrymen, were pronounced guilty or deserving of death: the one was, in his human na-



ture, accounted illiterate; the other designates himself, in the Koran, "the illiterate prophet:" the former restored and perfected the legitimate patriarchal faith of Isaac; the latter restored and raised the spurious patriarchal faith of Ishmael: Christ ascended in bodily form into heaven; Mahomet feigned to have been taken up into heaven by night. Christ held intimate and immediate converse with the Father; Mahomet "pretended to have actually conversed with God in heaven:" both, by persecution, were driven into exile; Christ, at his nativity; Mahomet, on the first publication of his pretended mission: the one inherited, the other usurped, the characters of prophet, lawgiver, and king: Christ was the "Prophet like unto Moses;" Mahomet claimed to unite in himself the prophetic characteristics both of Moses and Christ: our Lord came to fulfil the law and the prophets; the Arabian antichrist claimed to be the last and greatest of the prophets, commissioned to perfect the preceding revelations of the law, the prophets, and the Gospel: both withdrew into the wilderness preparatory to entering on their public ministry: Christ chose twelve apostles, selected from the disciples at large; so did Mahomet, with the same object, and in avowed imitation of Christ: our Lord named, to act under the twelve, seventy disciples; Mahomet also had, out of the number of his disciples, seventy-three select followers: Christ was rejected by those of his own nation; so, at first, was Mahomet: denied by his brethren; so was Mahomet: the Jews persecuted the true Messiah unto the death; the Koreish would have put to death their spurious Messiah: the Messiah and Mahomet, lastly, alike recalled the heathen world from idolatry; only, the first by the sword of the Spirit, the second, by the sword of the flesh.

'Many of these resemblances, again, were studied imitations; but many, also, of necessity, were not. The common descent of the true Messiah, and of Mahomet, from Abraham,—and from one of the twelve sons, the twelve predicted sons of Israel and of Ishmael,—their common royal origin, and lowly parentage,—the corresponding symbols under which they were foretold, and the corresponding signs which marked their appearance, or which attended the first promulgation of their respective systems,—their analogous rejection by their own countrymen, and reception among strangers,—their common denial by their kindred,—the coincidence in their mortal persecution by the Jews and the Koreish,—the prospective analogy, in the last place, arising out of the permanence and universality of their several religions;—none of these circumstances of agreement were the result of design or imitation. While, in this historical parallel, as in that with Moses, both classes of coincidence have their needful and proper functions: the studied agreements, to prove Mahomet an antichrist; the undesigned, to mark, in the coming of this last and greatest of heresiarchs, the predisposing and overruling agency of a special Providence.' Vol. I. p. 291—298.

In the ensuing sections, the Author takes a comparative view of the moral, doctrinal, and ritual branches of Islam, which he shews to be, under each of these aspects, either the servile copy of Judaism and Christianity, or the counterpart of their corruptions: if its best features fall immeasurably below the pure



and perfect standard of the Gospel, its worst have their parallels and precedents either in heretical corruptions of Christianity, or in the carnal ordinances of the Jewish law. On many points of his legislation, Mohammed has been unjustly traduced and ignorantly arraigned by Christian writers. Both the principle and the details of his law of marriage, were closely borrowed from the Jewish code; and in imposing that law upon his countrymen, he narrowed, instead of enlarging, the immemorial license of the Arabians. His law of polygamy, while it permits a Mussulman to take four wives, indirectly recommends him to marry only one; and the true character of the former restriction can be judged of aright, only by contrasting it with the unlimited polygamy sanctioned by the Talmudists. In his own case, it is true, Mohammed disregarded the limitations he had imposed; but even in this, the most disgraceful part of his conduct, he was, Mr. Forster remarks, 'an exact copyist of the 'Rabbinical code, which indulged the head of the State in an 'extraordinary license.'

'The eleven wives of the Arabian Impostor, in fact, only seem to complete the analogy with Judaism; as a parallel for the number of eighteen wives, allowed, by the casuistry of the Rabbins, to their chiefs or kings. The table of prohibited degrees in the Koran, exhibits, on the other hand, the most obvious plagiarism from the Pentateuch. And here the moral analogy certainly appears on its brighter side: for several of these prohibitions, especially that against marrying two sisters, were levelled by Mahomet against prevailing customs of the pagan Arabs.' Vol. I. p. 326.

The design of the Arabian Legislator appears to have been, to raise the standard of manners, and the moral tone of his countrymen. In this, he certainly succeeded; and although he abated much of the primitive rigour of his own laws, the morality of the Koran is inferior only to that of the New Testament. In illustration of the moral spirit of Mohammedism, Mr. Forster has extracted from the Proverbs of Ali, (an authority second only to the Koran,) a series of moral aphorisms, which he has arranged under distinct heads, bearing a strong resemblance, both in spirit and manner, to the didactic books of the Old Testament, and still more of the Apocrypha. They are translated from a valuable edition, in Arabic and Latin, issued from the Clarendon Press in 1806. As they will probably be new to our readers, we must make room for a few specimens.

'The fear of God maketh the heart clean.

'Fear God, and thou shalt be safe from all other fear.

'Tears flowing from the fear of the most high God, are a refreshment to the eyes.

- ‘ The word of God is the medicine of the heart.
- ‘ Prayer, in the night-watches, is the light of the pious soul.
- ‘ The remembrance of God, is the creed of the faithful.
- ‘ The remembrance of God, is the food of the heart, and the true fellowship of friendship.
- ‘ Submit thyself unto God, and he will exalt thee :  
Draw near to God with the obedience due to him, and he will draw near to thee.
- ‘ Patience in adversity is among the treasures of faith.
- ‘ How many are sad, whose sadness tends towards joy eternal ! How many are joyful, whose joy tends to everlasting sadness !
- ‘ How shall he find leisure for the concerns of another life, whose heart is occupied in the things of this world ?
- ‘ The love of the world is the fountain of all sin.
- ‘ The food of the world is poison ; and its furniture corruption.
- ‘ Sell thy worldly for eternal goods, and thou shalt have great gain.
- ‘ Be ye of the number of the sons of another life ; and not of the number of the sons of this world : for every son shall adhere to his mother in the day of resurrection.
- ‘ The silver sequin of the poor man, is brighter in the sight of God, than the golden dinar of the rich.
- ‘ The best part of alms is their concealment.
- ‘ Thy garment, wherewith thou clothest another, will be more enduring to thee, than that wherein thou art thyself clothed.
- ‘ A liberal unbeliever may sooner hope for Paradise, than an avaricious Mahometan.
- ‘ Chastise thine enviers by becoming their benefactor : amend thine enemies, by deserving well of them.
- ‘ Do good to the evil-doer, and thou shalt prevail over him\*.
- ‘ The most excellent government, is the government of our anger.
- ‘ Satan obtains a victory over him whom his anger conquers.
- ‘ To resist desire, and to keep thyself unstained by the things of this world, is the ornament of religion.
- ‘ The heart is the treasurer of the tongue.
- ‘ A little that sufficeth, is better than abundance that causeth the heart to swell.
- ‘ Forgetfulness of death is the lust of the heart.
- ‘ He doth not die, who maketh it a science to live.
- ‘ I marvel at him who repairs the house that passeth away, but dilapidates the enduring habitation.
- ‘ Lay aside thy glory, and lower thy pride, and remember thy tomb :  
For thither shall be thy transit :  
And as thou hast sowed, so shalt thou reap ;  
And as thou hast judged, so shalt thou be judged ;  
And as thou hast given to-day, the same shalt thou receive to-morrow.’

---

\* So Sadi, the Persian Moralist, says to the virtuous man, ‘ Confer benefits on him who has injured thee.’ The elegant distichs to the same effect, translated by Sir W. Jones from the Persian Anacreon, must be familiar to our readers.

But if the ethics of the Koran approach so nearly to the pure morality of the Inspired Volume as to indicate the true source from which they were derived, the doctrinal parallel is, on some points, still more close, and fully justifies the designation applied to Mohammedism by Mede, as 'a Christian heresy.' The recognition of the doctrine of the resurrection, is of itself an incontestable proof, not merely that Mohammed had access to the means of Christian instruction, but that he was a believer in one of the most distinguishing doctrines of the faith of Christ. But he went much beyond this. The belief professed by Mohammed and his followers concerning the person and divine mission of Our Lord, comprises the following Christian verities:—

'They acknowledge him to be the *Λόγος*, or Word of God, in a mysterious sense, proceeding from the Father. So the Koran, in the version there given of the angelic salutation: "The angels said, O Mary, verily God sendeth thee good tidings, that thou shalt bear the Word, proceeding from himself: his name shall be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary." The lowest interpretation put by the commentators on this passage, asserts Christ to be called the Word, "because he was conceived by the word or command of God, without a father." 2. They own Jesus as the Messiah of the Jews, and make common cause with Christians, on this question, against them. 3. They maintain, with the Catholic Church, our Lord's incarnation of a pure virgin, by the immediate power or spirit of God. 4. His immaculate conception. 5. His sole exemption, the blessed Virgin only excepted, from the touch of Satan, or the stain of Adam's transgression. 6. His office in heaven as mediator and intercessor between God and man. 7. His place and final supremacy as the appointed judge of all men, Mahomet himself included, at the last day.' Vol. I. pp. 365, 6.

The fabulous puerilities of the Koran and its expositors, concerning the life and miracles of Our Lord, Mr. Forster remarks, are rarely of Mohammedan invention, being traceable, in almost every instance, to the apocryphal gospels and other remains of Christian antiquity; while the ridiculous legends blended with the doctrine of the resurrection and other fragments of Christian truth, are drawn from the Rabbinical writers. In every deviation from Christianity, it thus still approximates to Judaism, so as continually to keep up its spurious relation to the true religion, in both its branches. Some of its theological errors and absurdities, were indeed borrowed from the ancient Christian heresies; and a very free use appears to have been made of the works of Ephrem the Syrian.

'That memorable controversy, for example, concerning the creation or non-creation of the Koran, which, under the Abasside dynasty, kindled the fires of persecution throughout the eastern portion of the Saracen empire, was but a faithful copy of the Rabbinical disputation concerning the creation or non-creation of the books of the Law or



Scriptures of the Old Testament. In like manner, the belief inculcated by the Koran and its commentators, that Christ did not really suffer on the Cross in his own person, but only in appearance,—a shadowy representation being substituted to deceive the by-standers, while Jesus himself was withdrawn and carried up to heaven;—this belief was nothing more than a revival of the wild imagination prevalent among the Gnostics, with whom the doctrine of a *notional* crucifixion formed a favourite article of faith.' Vol. I. p. 394.

The ritual analogy of Mohammedism with Judaism, is observable throughout its institutions. The legal postures of the Mohammedan ritual are Jewish; its *kebla* is in imitation of the Jewish 'point of prayer'; its fasts and festivals are adopted from the Jewish calendar; the annual pilgrimage to Mecca corresponds to the ascent to Jerusalem; and, notwithstanding the strangely erroneous assertion of Mr. Gibbon, that it is 'destitute of priesthood or sacrifice', Islamism has its great national sacrifice, its 'passover', as well as its high-priest. The sacrificial rites performed during the pilgrimage to Mecca, are circumstantially regulated in the Koran. These rites, however, as well as the pilgrimage to Mecca, and circumcision itself, were of immemorial usage among the Ante-Mohammedan Arabians, and were only adopted by Mohammed. Mina is the Mount Moriah of the Moslem, the place where Abraham is believed to have gone to offer up his son Isaac; and there, accordingly, every *hajji* sacrifices a sheep. But the *Beit Allah* (or Bethel) of Mecca, with its miraculous *διοπετης*, the Black Stone, had been the object of idolatrous veneration, and Mount Arafat had been the Meru of the Bedoweens, ages before Mohammed became master of Mecca and its temple. Policy, no doubt, induced him so far to accommodate his institutions to the most ancient customs of his countrymen. The alterations he introduced in the nature of these rites, were at the same time of the most decided character. The *Kaaba* is said to have been ornamented with as many idols as there are days in the year; and the ceremonies practised (if the traditional information given to Burckhardt can be depended upon) were far more closely related to pagan orgies, than to the patriarchal faith. The sacrifices appear to have been, like all the blood-offerings of the heathen worship, of a propitiatory kind; a notion which Mohammed endeavours, in the Koran, to discountenance and correct. 'Their flesh', he says, (speaking of the cattle sacrificed,) 'is not accepted of God, neither their blood, but your piety is accepted of him.'

Mr. Forster proceeds, in the opening section of his second volume, to compare the Koran with the Bible, for the purpose of exhibiting the extent of the agreement between the original and the anti-Christian parody. The instances of direct pla-

g iarism and studied imitation, are shewn to be too numerous to admit of reasonable doubt, whether the Author of the pseudo-Bible was, by some means, well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures. The fact is, that he has actually employed the materials of the Old and New Testaments in the construction of his Koran. The extensive collation of the text of the Koran with the parallel passages in the Inspired writings, which Mr. Forster has been at the pains of instituting, will shew, in the most conclusive manner, the imitative character of the spurious revelation. Some of the coincidences are slight, and perhaps accidental; but the cumulative evidence supplied by the whole selection of passages, is decisive. Such being the fact, that the Koran contains 'large and various materials drawn from every part of the sacred volume, from the book of Genesis to the 'Apocalypse', and that Mohammed was, indubitably, 'its chief author and contriver',—we are at a loss to understand, how it can remain 'an unsolved problem', whether Mohammed 'was, 'or was not, acquainted with our sacred volume.' Our Author's admission on this point, sounds very much like a palpable contradiction. Gibbon styles Mohammed an illiterate barbarian, at the same time that, with all the credulity of a sceptic, he is disposed to attribute the whole composition to his unassisted genius. Illiterate, he may have been; although the use he makes of his ignorance, real or affected, in the Koran, to prove the genuineness of the revelation, tends, as has been remarked, to bring into suspicion his declarations upon that point. But, whether he could read or not, he had evidently access, directly or indirectly, to both the canonical and the apocryphal scriptures. The charge that he was assisted in the composition, he himself notices in a way that shews a particular individual to have been suspected, and that individual a foreigner. 'We also know that they say, Verily, a certain man teacheth him 'to compose the Koran. The tongue of the person unto whom 'they incline, is a foreign tongue; but this, wherein the Koran 'is written, is the perspicuous Arabic tongue.'\* The composition was, in all probability, as regards the language, dictated by himself; but, for his information, if not drawn immediately from the documents themselves, he must have been indebted to instructors or confederates well conversant with the whole range of Jewish literature, as well as with the Christian Scriptures.

We must pass over the next section, though abounding with much curious matter, in which the Author traces the analogy and correspondence between the three religions, in relation to

---

\* It has been remarked, that the name by which Mohammed designates the Apostles of Jesus (*Al-Hâwariyan*), is not Arabic, but Ethiopic.

the sects and reputed heresies into which they have respectively branched. According to a Mohammedan tradition, the Jews are represented to be divided into *seventy-one* sects, the Christians into *seventy-two*, and the Mussulmans into *seventy-three*; which last number, it is pretended by the doctors, was predicted by Mohammed himself. The comparison of Mohammedism with Popery, is the subject of the tenth section. The leading heads of correspondence are thus enumerated.

‘ 1. Coincidence in time : the beginning of the seventh century stands as the common era, for the commencement of the Papal and Mahometan tyrannies.

‘ 2. Antithetical relation of place : Papal Rome held in the West, exactly the position which Mahometanism occupied in the East ; was, in other words, the providential scourge to western, which Mahometanism was to eastern, Christendom.

‘ 3. Each despotism was, in its very essence, a union of the spiritual and the temporal power ; and such a union, as neither time nor change, which loosen every bond of merely human policy, has been able to dissolve.

‘ 4. The Pope was the acknowledged temporal and spiritual head of the Roman or Latin church : the Caliph the acknowledged temporal and spiritual head of the Mahometan world ; insomuch as to be styled, by both Christian and Jewish writers in the middle ages, the Pope of the Mahometans.

‘ 5. The Roman pontiffs claimed to derive their authority, and that of their church, by regular succession, from Saint Peter, the first of the apostles : the caliphs claimed to derive theirs, by regular succession, from Mahomet, according to their creed, the last and greatest of the apostles of God.

‘ 6. The Papal and Mahometan tyrannies alike advanced the claim to universal sovereignty.

‘ 7. They alike enforced their pretensions by persecution and the sword.

‘ 8. Mahometanism instituted the Saracen holy wars : Popery originated the Christian crusades.

‘ 9. Popery, among other first fruits of the crusades, produced the mendicant orders : Mahometanism, the parallel mendicant orders of Dervises, Fakirs, Santons, &c.

‘ 10. Mahometanism was the parent, Popery the nurse, of the schoolmen.

‘ 11. The Christian princes of the West all held their crowns by authority of the Roman pontiffs ; to whom accordingly they did fealty and homage for them : all Mahometan princes held theirs, on a like tenure, by authority of the caliphs.

‘ 12. Popery and Mahometanism alternately appear, first, as the extinguishers, and, secondly, as the restorers, of letters.’ Vol. II. pp. 116, 17.

After illustrating these several points of analogy, the Author proceeds to examine the further coincidences between the eastern and western anti-Christ, in their respective establishments and



institutions,—their pilgrimages, religious orders, and ecclesiastical polity. Lastly, he remarks,

‘The character of that inveterate and sanguinary warfare between the Papal and Mahometan tyrannies, the spirit of which still outlives the vicissitudes of ten centuries, combines with their contemporaneous rise, progress, and decay, and with all the heads of the general analogy specified in these pages, to mark the prophetic relation of the two powers, as, indeed, the great heads of that Antichrist foretold by Christ and his Apostles, and vividly foreshown in the Scriptures of both Testaments. If, in the earlier ages of Mahometanism, in obedience to the precepts of the Koran, the successors of Mahomet carried a war of religion and persecution into the heart of France and Italy,—in the era of the crusades, the self-named successors of Saint Peter, in the genuine spirit of Mahometanism, exchanging the sword of the Spirit for the arm of flesh, bore the terrors of war and persecution into the midst of Mahometan Asia. To the warlike fanaticism of the armed apostles of Islamism, was now everywhere opposed the kindred fanaticism of a military priesthood, arrayed under the banners of papal Rome. And the common spirit of the hostile superstitions is hardly more legible in the annals of the crusades themselves, than in the history of those bloody wars between the Turks and Franks, by which the crusades were succeeded. Nor is it the least remarkable feature of coincidence in this rivalry of persecution, that, while, in more modern times, the atrocities of the piratical states of Barbary have served to keep alive the character of the antichristian conflict of Mahometanism with Popery on the shores of the Mediterranean,—the cruelties of the Portuguese in the East, and the dreadful enormities of the inquisition of Goa, have registered, in notes of blood and fire, along the coasts of India, the character of the no less antichristian controversy, maintained by the authority of the church of Rome, against the Mahometan world.’ Vol. II. pp. 140, 1.

Section the eleventh is devoted to an examination of the causes and effects of the Crusades, and contains an elaborate defence of the policy in which those ‘holy wars’ originated. With this portion of the Inquiry, we have been less pleased than with any other section of the work. The Author betrays a warmth of feeling, in combating the opinions of Gibbon and Dr. Robertson, which savours more of the advocate, than of the philosophical inquirer; and his assertions are strong in proportion to the slenderness of his arguments. ‘Both on the question of the original policy of the Crusades, and on that of their general consequences’, he says, ‘a revulsion has at length taken place; and the opinions of Dr. Robertson on the former subject, and of Mr. Gibbon on both, appear, in the present day, to have fallen into merited disrepute’. With whom?—By Mr. Charles Mills, the Author of the best history of the Crusades in English literature, and by Mr. Berington, the Author of a Literary History of the Middle Ages, those opi-

nions have been ably supported; and Mr. Hallam has shewn, with how little justice a beneficial influence is ascribed to those wars as having accelerated the progress of political liberty. Mr. Forster asks, 'What would have become of Christian Europe but for the Crusades'? and he answers it by an assertion which he would find it much more difficult to substantiate, than he imagines; that 'the Crusades supplied the only sufficient means to save western, from sharing the fate of eastern Europe.' We believe, with Mr. Berington, 'that they neither retarded the progress of the invading enemy, nor for a single day the fate of the eastern empire'. Had the relief of the Greek Emperor been their real object, a shadow of right might have attached to the cause of the Crusaders. But Alexius soon discovered his fear and hatred of his new allies, and the Greek empire fell before the defenders of Christendom. Mr. Forster dwells with complacency upon the first crusade: he seems to forget *the fourth*\*. We deeply regret that those barbarous and anti-Christian expeditions, should have found in the present day a Christian apologist.

The last two sections treat of the analogy between Christianity and Mohammedism, in their influences on National Character and Civilization; on Industry, Manufactures, and Commerce; on Arts and Sciences, and the Advancement of Learning. In this part of his work, the Author professes to be greatly indebted to the treatises of MM. Heeren and De Choiseul D'Aillecourt "*Sur L'Influence des Croisades*"; to that of M. Oelsner "*Sur les Effets de la Religion de Mohammed*"; and to the "*Histoire de la Domination des Arabes en Espagne*", by M. des Marles. In extending to these subjects of inquiry, the theory of the former section, respecting the beneficial effects of the Crusades, the Author has, in our judgement, been misled by his French authorities; and he has thus mingled some very questionable positions with his correct and interesting representation of the share which the Saracens had in originating the revival of letters. It was by way of Spain, not of Palestine, that Europe became possessed of the treasures of the East. The Crusades were adapted rather to put an end to all beneficial intercourse with the Oriental nations, among whom, in the better days of the Abassides, as well as under some of the Fatimite Khalifs, the itinerants, both of commerce and of superstition, pursued their errands in safety.

\* The Saracenic revival began, under the Abbassides, with the en-

---

\* The fourth of Gibbon, but really the fifth. See, for an article on Mills's History of the Crusades, Eclectic Rev. Vol. XIII. N.S. pp. 497—525.

couragement of letters, by extending protection and patronage to learned men, especially, in its earliest stage, to learned strangers. The caliphs of the house of Abbas drew to their court, and within their palaces, scholars from all parts of the East; especially learned Jews and Christians from Syria, in that age the most enlightened, if not the only enlightened, quarter of the world. These individuals were the instruments employed, both to procure Greek or Syriac manuscripts, and to translate them into the Arabic; to give permanent effect to the views of their princely patrons, by forming the minds and manners of their successors; and to institute and preside over those establishments which, under their direction, rapidly arose into famous seats of learning.

‘The precedent thus nobly set by the Abbassides of Asia, was soon wisely followed by the Omniades of Spain. These princes, in their turn, invited into their kingdom the philosophers newly formed, under the rival dynasty, in the schools of Asia. Learning and ability, wherever found, constituted a sure passport to the favour of the Spanish caliphs. Their possessors were diligently sought out, hospitably entertained, and generously recompensed. Thus, in the East and in the West, the first step in the restored progress of the human mind, lay in the encouragement afforded to letters, under the Arabian princes, by patronage extended to learned men.’ Vol. II. pp. 341, 342.

Mr. Forster has not overlooked the very important services which the Jews, at this period, rendered to Christendom, in advancing the progress of learning and civilization.

‘This miraculous people, the wonder of the world, equally in their rise and in their unparalleled reverses, had long languished under the yoke of the Christian empires, in the East and West. After the fall of the eastern empire before the arms of the Saracens, the Jews of Asia, for a time, suffered heavy persecution. At the very period, however, in which they were most oppressed by the bigotry of the Asiatic caliphs, a door of escape was opened for them, by the wise and enlarged policy of the princes of the house of Oummiah, in Spain. In the Spanish peninsula, indeed, from the period of its first reduction, in which they largely assisted, the Jews had experienced, from the Saracen conquerors, special protection and countenance. Made aware by experience, of the importance of these colonists to the prosperity of the state, the first Abderahmans gladly invited their suffering brethren to emigrate from Syria into Spain. The summons was joyfully obeyed: the emigrations were many and large; in one instance, the numbers amounted to fifty thousand Syrian Jews. The expectations of their benefactors were not disappointed. The Jews, thenceforward, exclusively possessed the commerce of the peninsula: and Spain, through their instrumentality, soon acquired a monopoly of the chief commerce of Asia, Africa, and Europe.

‘Under a higher superintendence, the Spanish Jews, it appears, had a nobler function appointed them to discharge. In their new-found prosperity, they manifested, once more, some traces of that mental and moral dignity, which had belonged to their character, as the chosen



people of God ; and which, however forfeited by long apostasy, and obscured by many misfortunes, had not then, and as yet never have, been altogether effaced. They now betook themselves, with all the zeal of novices, to the study of the Arabian and Aristotelic philosophy. From the age of Honain, to that of Maimonides, their most celebrated Rabbins formed their minds and manners in this school. And, by a singular and mysterious Providence, it was so ordered, in the event, that the forsaken offspring of Isaac, recovered, for a season, from the extremity of their shame, were raised socially, mentally, and morally, by the hand of the descendants of Ishmael, and by the fostering influences of Mahometanism :—were raised, in the critical hour,—the birth-day of the first general revival of letters, to become instruments, in the hands of an over-ruling power, (and they were then, in virtue of the very curse under which they laboured, and which rendered them restless wanderers upon the earth, the sole adequate and capable instruments,) for conveying over Western Christendom, the early lights of Arabian science and philosophy.' Vol. II. p. 324—326.

It was, as Robertson remarks, through the medium of the Jews of Spain, that 'geometry, astronomy, and geography, the sciences on which navigation is founded, became objects of studious attention.' The providential agency of this extraordinary people appears, therefore, Mr. Forster remarks, not only in facilitating and furthering the advancement of Europe, but in contributing to the discovery of the New World.

'Accordingly, we find the illustrious Don Henry, in the infancy of his great projects, consulting with the Jews settled in Portugal ; his grand-nephew, King John, despatching Portuguese Jews to Egypt, in order that they might meet and direct his emissaries on their return from an overland expedition of inquiry into India ; and Ferdinand the Catholic, of Spain, appointing "two Jewish physicians, eminent cosmographers, whom he was accustomed to consult in matters of this kind", his commissioners, in consort with the Bishop of Ceuta, to confer with Columbus on the subject of his project for the discovery of a new world. Such, in a word, was, at this period, the superior science of the Jews, that it exacted deference from their very persecutors, and triumphed even over the dark prejudices of Spanish intolerance.' Ib. pp. 327, 8.

In these very statements, we have a sufficient proof, that the Crusades had little share in promoting,—that they tended only to arrest, and did actually retard the progress of the revival of letters, and the march of civilization. On the interests of Christianity, of public morals, and of religious liberty, their influence was most disastrous. The traffic in indulgences, the dragooning of heretics, the extermination of the Albigenses, the establishment of the Inquisition, and the successful counteraction of the incipient reformation,—these were the bitter fruits of the holy wars.

The Author's general argument depends in no respect upon

his theoretic view of the Crusades ; and though we must regard it as a flaw in his work, it occasions no flaw in his reasonings ; it does not at all aid the analogy he labours to establish. His historical retrospect of the revival and progress of science and literature, forms one of the most interesting and able sections of his work. In closing his parallel view of the respective and reciprocal influences of Christianity and Mohammedism, Mr. Forster remarks, that ' although in every sense subsidiary, the ' office discharged by the latter was not the less important.

' It preserved the lights of the ancient world through the long eclipse of the middle ages ; it enlarged those lights, in the paths most directly leading to the advancement of the human mind ; it imparted them gradually to Europe, in proportion as Europe became capable of receiving them ; and thus opened, without overpowering, the mental vision of the nations of the West. When the proper time was come, when the western nations were at length fitted for the trust, Mahometanism wholly surrendered its temporary charge. Christianity, invigorated by the pause of centuries, resumed, with a vast increase of power, her proper office ; and the scattered rays of knowledge, which had been preserved from extinction by the spurious faith, were concentrated by the happy influences of the true religion, and brought to bear, with united force, upon the awakened mind of Europe.

' These were great and peculiar services of Mahometanism ; services clearly and eminently providential. And from experience of the benefits conferred on Christendom through this arch-heresy, in past ages, we seem authorized to anticipate further, and, not improbably, superior benefits, in ages yet to come ; since the religion of Mahomet appears at least equally fitted to prepare the way, at a period still future, for the more universal diffusion of Christian lights and Christian civilization.

' Thus, in its mental character and effects, the providential office of the Koran, however subordinate, seems to have been essential for the accomplishment of the ends to be attained by the divine dispensation of the Gospel. The two systems, emanating from the one patriarchal source, appear continually to converge towards one great consummation,—the glorious fulfilment of the two-fold covenant of God with Abraham, in its social and intellectual aspect, by the eventual re-union of his sons Isaac and Ishmael, as joint civilizers of the world.'

Vol. II. pp. 359, 360.

In a concluding section, Mr. Forster briefly adverts to the prospective bearings of Mohammedism upon the future. It is, he remarks, one of the compensatory features of this ' arch-heresy', that it has provided, in the vast diffusion of the Arabic idiom, an ' instrument of spiritual commerce' and channel of communication, which will greatly facilitate the eventual triumph of Christian truth. We cannot agree with him, however, as to there being any ' inherent aptitude in this marvellous superstition for the recovery of the *barbarous* heathen nations

'from idolatry', which should render it, in their case, a suitable and requisite pioneer for Christianity. We admit, that 'a state of barbarism is essentially adverse to the propagation of the Gospel by ordinary means'; but we must strongly deprecate the idea of any 'unsuitableness in the Gospel scheme, in its immediate application, to the condition and capabilities' of the most uncivilized nations. This is dangerous and unscriptural language. Notions like these have led to all sorts of tampering with the Gospel by way of accommodating it to the barbarous heathen, and they well comport with the Romish policy; but what has ever been the result of such impotent expedients? "The foolishness of God is wiser than men." There is no state of barbarism, how adverse soever to Christianity, over which it has not triumphed,—triumphed by those very means which the philosophers of this world decry as foolishness,—those by which it was first propagated, and by which alone its final triumph will be consummated. The 'Gospel scheme,' addressed to the frozen Greenlander, the wild American Indian, the licentious Tahitian, and the brutal Hottentot, 'the most unpromising,' surely, of all proselytes,—has, in our own days, effected what nothing else could effect,—the civilization, the intellectual transfiguration, we had almost said, of the most listless, mindless, and degraded portions of the human race.

Hitherto, Islamism has, as our Author remarks, 'surpassed all forms of Paganism itself in the bigoted resistance which it has opposed to the propagation of the Gospel.' But the Bible and the Koran have scarcely yet come into contact. Mohammedism has triumphed over Romanism; it is the purer and the more Christian creed; but till of late years, it has never been placed in immediate opposition to the Gospel. It has hitherto been neither fairly nor wisely dealt with. A mistaken estimate of the Mohammedan superstition has prevailed, which has disqualified the Christian advocate from combating with success the real errors of that creed. This false estimate, these volumes will powerfully tend to correct; and by so doing, they will render a most important service to the cause of truth.

We ought to say a few words respecting Mr. Neale's volume; but we regret that the commendation due to the Author's design, cannot be extended to its execution. It affords throughout, a signal illustration of the very erroneous and inadequate views which have been generally taken of the character and history of Mohammedism, and proves how much such a work as Mr. Forster's was needed. Mr. Neale's *Refutation of Mohammedism* is as little adapted to convince an antagonist, or to instruct those who agree with him, as the "*Refutation of Calvinism*" put forth by the 'distinguished Prelate' who is the subject of his panegyric and regrets. He is doubly unfortunate



in the time at which his volume makes its appearance ; too soon to enable him to profit by Mr. Forster's labours, too late to have the benefit of his patron's approbation. It is but justice, however, to remark, that the mistakes into which Mr. Neale has fallen, are those of his authorities ; and if these are not always the best, they were probably the only ones to which he could obtain easy access.

It is remarkable, that the character of Mohammed should have received equal injustice at the hands of the pious Prideaux and the infidel Voltaire. The latter has introduced him on the French stage as the most execrable of monsters, and sneers at Sale and M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers, who wish to make him pass, he says, for 'a great man chosen by Providence to punish the Christians',—a Numa or a Theseus. In the third volume of the Bombay Literary Transactions, there is a zealous and indignant defence of the character and religion of the Arabian heresiarch, by a learned writer whose candour towards every false system of religion, is much more conspicuous than his reverence for the true. The paper contains much that is bold and paradoxical in assertion, and incorrect both in statement and reasoning, but it sufficiently exposes the strange and discreditable ignorance and misapprehension that have prevailed upon the subject, and shews how little the cause of Christianity can be promoted by bringing false charges against its adversaries. In conclusion, we must again express our sense of the great obligations under which Mr. Forster has laid the Christian public by his present work,—the result, as he informs us, of the thoughts and studies of nine years, and which, by its intrinsic value, as well as by the ability it displays, will entitle him to no mean or ephemeral reputation.

Art. II. *Italy as it is ;* or, a Narrative of an English Family's Residence for Three Years in that Country. By the Author of "Four Years in France." 8vo. pp. 453. London. 1828.

SO far as we are able to ascertain our own feelings, we are neither fastidious nor capricious in our critical mood. Courtesy, as a medium suited to all exigencies, and available in all kinds of intercourse and negotiation between man and man, we are anxious to maintain inviolate, even where we might plead a reasonable justification for laying it aside. It shall, however, be frankly confessed, that we have felt, on the present occasion, a strong temptation to depart from this even and equidistant line, and to encounter a partizan in the spirit of controversy ; to amuse ourselves with his airs, to visit his flippancy with sarcasm, and to deal rather roughly with his petulant and po-

lemical sallies. But bad taste and bad feeling should warn, rather than provoke; the errors of an antagonist afford no sanction for our own; and we feel ourselves, in the present instance, happily released from the necessity of energetic reprisals, since the attack is feeble, and the adversary neither vigorous nor well-disciplined.

"Italy as it is"—a somewhat awakening promise, and a title that should have been followed by a very different book from that which lies before us. Learning, discrimination, impartiality, active and unwearied research, are among the first requisites for the adequate performance of such a task; but, without venturing absolutely to deny their possession by the present Writer, we must be permitted to say, that he has given but slight evidence of it in his work. His "Four Years in France" obtained, we believe, some attention from the public; and there can be no difficulty in accounting for the notice which it excited. Independently of the amusing snappishness on controversial subjects, which gave it piquancy, and of a notable miracle, worked up in a style of grave absurdity that would have been exquisitely ridiculous, but for its connexion with parental feelings; there was a 'wonderous tale' of conversion, and an affecting detail of domestic calamity. These could not, of course, be told over again; and, although the polemics might serve for a second *entrée*, it was impossible to spread them out to so large a surface, or so completely to identify them with personal narrative. The present volume, then, is left to obtain, by its own intrinsic worth, and with no aid from sources of extraneous interest, such general notice as it may deserve; and, if this be all, it will be neither very extensive nor very durable. Tastes will, of course, vary; but, for ourselves, we shall take leave to express our want of relish for the common-place details of family travel and casual residence. We care but little whether a gentleman and his *menage* require a larger or a smaller suite of apartments; whether they journey by Diligence, or in their own carriage; whether they export their own servants, or hire them on the spot; whether they are well or ill on the road, comfortable or fidgetty in their lodgings: all this is so exclusively their own concern, that we can be well contented not to be let into the secret. But when, at this time of day, a writer undertakes to furnish us with a book about Italy—*Italy as it is*—we expect something more than these insipid and unmeaning trivialities. That noble country, second only to Greece in its sources of intellectual excitement, will never cease to supply new objects of admiration to active and intelligent research. Its antiquities, restlessly and ably as they have been explored, will yet repay the labour of centuries. The history and the practice of Art, can nowhere else be adequately

studied and thoroughly understood. The Italian annals are, both intrinsically and relatively, fraught with lessons of indescribable interest and importance; they connect ancient with modern times; they bring down the succession of events and characters, through scenes and periods which attract to themselves, as to a common centre, all the lines and rays of history; they transfer from hand to hand, along the track of ages, the wisdom, the knowledge, and the story of antique days; and these alone, the chronicles of Italy, skilfully attached to the localities amid which the traveller may move or sojourn, afford continually recurring means of exciting and satisfying curiosity and sympathy. The scenery and manners of these regions are well suited to their romantic traditions; and we shall enliven this article by translating, from the new edition of Sismondi's "*Histoire des Républiques Italiennes du Moyen Age*"\*, the spirited exordium of his forty-second chapter, where he runs a descriptive parallel between Italy and Greece. 'Nature herself', he writes, 'has taken pleasure in lavishing on these two magnificent countries, gifts nearly similar. She has multiplied, in both, picturesque sites and combinations; she has heaped one upon another, majestic rocks, given depth and richness to the smiling valleys, and poured forth refreshing waterfalls; she has decorated, as for a rejoicing day, their plains with the most luxurious vegetation; and, while she has delighted to enrich both Italy and Greece with the wonders of her power, she has also endowed their inhabitants with corresponding qualities; so far, at least, as we can trace the primitive character of a people when it has been submitted to the operation of different governments. The qualities common to the Italians and the Greeks,—those permanent qualities, of which the germ has subsisted through every change until the present time,—are, a quick and brilliant imagination, a sensibility readily excited and promptly extinguished, an innate taste for the arts, with faculties peculiarly adapted to the appreciation and reproduction of whatever is beautiful and exquisite. In the festivals of the peasantry, we may, even in the present day, distinguish men, the counterparts of those who animated, by their applause, the genius of Phidias, of Michael Angelo, and of Raphael. They

---

\* We cannot suffer the present opportunity to pass away, without renewing our recommendation of this excellent work. The subject is admirably selected, and treated in a masterly manner. The second edition, without having undergone extensive alterations, has been materially improved, especially in the style, which, in the earlier publication, was somewhat stiff and antiquated, savouring of the musty manuscripts and quaint chronicles with which the Writer had been so long and intimately conversant.



‘adorn their hats with flowers; their mantles hang in picturesque folds, like those of the antique statues; their language is figurative and impassioned; their features are expressive of ardent and varying emotion. Their festivals are imperfect, if unmingled with higher than merely sensual gratifications; if the church in which they assemble, be not set out with striking and judicious ornature; and if harmonious and devotional music be wanting. Their very sports are intellectual. When they have saved a portion of their earnings, they do not waste it in drunkenness or debauchery, but pay it as a tribute to the theatres, to the improvisatori, or to the narrators of lively and amusing tales. Italy is, at the present day, the only country where the cowherd and the vine-dresser, the husbandman and the shepherd, frequent, with their wives and their children, the exhibitions of the stage,—where these classes are capable of comprehending dramas which represent the heroes of past times, and of poetical traditions with which they are partially acquainted.’

For all this, however, strange to say, the volume before us supplies no text; and we must take as we find it, ‘Italy as it is.’ But before we devote a few paragraphs more specifically to the present work, we must lament our want either of apprehension or of faith, touching a favourite notion of our Author’s, that ‘none but an English Catholic, of all Englishmen, can give a fair and rational account of Italy.’ Why? Has not a Protestant as keen an eye for the beauties of nature and of art, as acute a perception of excellence and defect, as effective a skill in the exploration of antiquity, as quick a discernment of the peculiarities of human character, as enlightened a comprehension of political and municipal doctrines and relations? Yes, all this may be; but he has no relish for the pantomime of popery; and he ventures ‘to ridicule, with more than boyish petulance, the mummary of the mass’! Why not come to the point at once, and lay it down as the indispensable qualifications for Italian travel, that men are neither to see, think, nor feel for themselves; that they are to be short-sighted and narrow-minded; and that they are to speak, if possible, with reverence, but at least with gravity, of the pagan ritual of Rome—of the incense and aspersions, the mutterings and the antics, the cup withheld, and the unknown tongue? Before writers venture to assume a lofty bearing and peremptory tone, they would do wisely to make an accurate estimate of their qualifications, and by it to adjust the scale of their pretensions. Without asperity or rudeness, but with a frankness justified by the occasion, we say of the present Author, that we have not often met with a shallower logician, or a more inefficient polemic. He seems always in an ill-temper. Hit or miss, he never loses

an opportunity of giving a snarl or a sneer at Protestantism. His own country cannot escape disadvantageous comparisons, while intimations perpetually occur, of the superiority of former over present times, and of Popish over Protestant institutions. All this is not worth a reply; it has not even the semblance of argument; and we shall not attempt to condense a mere vapour, that we may afterwards have the pleasure of dissipating it.

A grave discussion of the various methods of getting from Nice to Genoa, precedes a full and particular account of the passage of the Alps, by the defile of Saorgio and the Col de Tende. Then follows a miscellaneous chapter concerning Turin, the Duke of Bedford, George III., Egyptian antiquities, and Dr. Paley. The wines of the Continent are eulogized at the expense of those 'muddy, ill-tasted, unwholesome, inflating' beverages, ale and brown stout. We extract the closing paragraph of this chapter, as containing a useful suggestion.

'A Genoese lady expressed to me her wonder that the English should flock to Nice, when at Genoa they might have the same advantage of climate, and, in addition, the resources of a great city. The remark deserves attention. There is sometimes rough weather at Genoa in the winter; but the orange-trees prove its climate and that of Nice to be similar. It is no further from England than Nice, and the passage of Mont Cenis and of the Apennines, can be terrible only to those who have not tried it. Genoa is a splendid and a curious city: it would afford better means than feluccas, of passing to the ports of Italy; and sea-bathing might be had, not indeed in the dirty waters of its harbour, but in the very pretty towns along the *riviera*.'

pp. 55, 56.

About Milan, we have little that is interesting, and nothing that strikes us as particularly new. Some trivial criticisms on the cathedral are enlivened by a characteristic eulogy on St. Charles Borromeo, who 'acquired', as we are informed, 'a reputation unequalled by that of any Anglican prelate *since the change of religion: before that epoch, many of our bishops had trodden the path*' of the canonized archbishop of Milan. The usual circumstances of travelling, with a collection of odds and ends in the way of observation, that were hardly worth recording, fill up the fifth chapter; and in the next, we reach Florence.

'Let an Englishman walk into the great square, the Piazza del Gran Duca at Florence, he will be immediately struck with the conviction, that he is in a town of a character at once novel, foreign, and magnificent. The colossal statues, the fountains, the arcades under the public buildings, and that frowning fortress of the middle ages, the Palazzo Vecchio, occupying a canton of the square, all is at once strange and imposing.' p. 140.

We are not sufficiently satisfied of the Author's skill as a critic in art, to be arrested by his descriptive comments on the painting, statuary, and architecture which adorn the palaces and piazzas of the capital of Tuscany. If there were no other symptoms of infirmity on this point, it would be enough for us, that he has ventured to launch the following criticism, of which the presumption is even surpassed by the incredible absurdity.

'A parting look, as we quit the Tribune, at the John Baptist of Raphael, and we follow our *custode*. He takes us to a large room filled with the portraits of eminent painters; Raphael d'Urbino has the place of honour amongst them: he merits this distinction as the most perfect imitator of nature. Yet, though it is not desirable that the art which improves upon nature should appear, it is desirable that nature should be improved upon. I will hazard the avowal, that Carlo Dolce, a painter of the second class, yet in some respects on this account, pleases me more than Raphael: the one satisfies; the other delights: the one is exact and finished, the other is lovely: one is true to art and nature, the other sometimes snatches a grace beyond the reach of both.' pp. 147, 148.

The attribution to Carlo Dolce, in contrast with Raffaele, of the 'art which improves upon nature', is admirable. If the very notion of such an improvement be not altogether absurd, to whom can it be ascribed with such eminence of desert, as to the painter of the Vatican? and of whose works can it be said with such emphasis of truth, that they delight, that they are fraught with unequalled loveliness, and that they 'snatch a grace beyond the reach of art?' And to deprive him of his wreath for such a rival! Had it been assigned to Allegri or Mazzuoli, some plea might have been framed, if not for the preference, at least for the comparison; but—*Carlo Dolce!*

A visit to the monastery of Vallombrosa affords the Writer an opportunity of reproving his Protestant countrymen for a habit of 'petulant sneering' at the monastic life. He should have been more tolerant of a disposition in which he is himself so apt to indulge towards men and things that displease him; and he should have been careful not to lose sight of truth in the intimation, that its patronage of the conventual system is alleged as a justification of separation from the church of Rome. We question if it were ever so alleged; we doubt if any one ever took it as a distinct and exclusive ground of rejection, that 'such a mode of life' is sanctioned and recommended by the Romish hierarchy; and we are quite sure, that these pitiful evasions of the deep accusations and decisive arguments which have been urged against the papal usurpations and delusions, can have no other effect than to give painful illustration of the



state of mind which dictated them. Our readers shall be indulged with the description of an English convent.

‘Many years ago, my friend, Dr. John Douglass, Vicar Apostolic of the London district, took me to see a nunnery at Hammersmith. The house, though it would have been a large one for a private family, was small for a convent. I found a society of ladies, cheerful, well-mannered; who, from the habits of a life devoted to religion, seemed to have got rid of pride, envy, frivolity, and of all the feelings of vanity and ill-humour, which so often prevail in companies assembled for the express purpose of being agreeable to each other.

‘An old nun, of more than seventy, distinguished me with particular favour. With all the vivacity of a girl of eighteen, she took hold of my arm: “Come, I will show you the house!” She took me to the chapel, refectory, work-room; to the garden, near which was the cemetery, where a grave was dug ready for the next who should die. My nun then said, “Now I will take you to my chamber: cells we call our bed-rooms.” It was a neat little room; on the bed was laid a crucifix. “There is my husband: I never had any other, and I never will.”’ p. 221.

Rome, to which we must at once transport our readers, does not make a very splendid figure under the hand of our present *cicerone*; and we shall not be long detained by his details and descriptions. He speaks, as might have been expected, in high terms of the late popes, and gives an interesting illustration of the tolerant practice of the Romish court. The Dutchess of D——, then at Rome, applied, in behalf of the English residents, to Cardinal Gonzalvi, for permission to have divine service performed by a Protestant clergyman. His Eminence, in consequence, referred the matter to Pius VIIth., who liberally accorded the licence, without involving himself in the awkwardness of specific concession. When it was stated to him, that the Protestants wished for his sanction to the reading of the English liturgy, he replied:—‘*Meglio il parlo senza*’—‘Better do it without’. The remains of ancient Rome are rather unceremoniously treated both by the modern Romans and by the present writer. The Coliseum ‘astonishes by its bulk, but it is ‘ugly bulk’. The ‘minor ruins’ disappointed him. The Temple of Peace affords shelter to carts and rubbish, while the Fane of Venus and Rome makes a commodious pig-sty. The Temple of Antoninus is a government office; and the Theatre of Marcellus is crammed with dirty hovels.

At this point we shall take leave of our Author. There is a considerable portion remaining of slight detail relating to the churches and curiosities of Rome; but it does not invite comment, nor would it justify extensive citation.

- Art III. 1. *A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke.* By Dr. Frederick Schleiermacher. With an Introduction, by the Translator; containing an Account of the Controversy respecting the Origin of the Three First Gospels, since Bishop Marsh's Dissertation. 8vo. pp. clxi. and 320. Price 13s. London. 1825.
2. *Predigt, gehalten bey der Wieder-Eröffnung der Deutsch-Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche, in der Savoy, zu London, am 16ten Sonntage nach Trinitatis, dem 21sten Sept. 1828, von Dr. Schleiermacher, Professor der Theologie an der Universität zu Berlin.* A Sermon, preached at the Re-Opening of the German Lutheran Church, in the Savoy, on the 16th Sunday after Trinity, Sept. 21, 1828, by the Rev. Frederick Schleiermacher, D.D., one of the Ministers of Berlin, and Professor of Divinity in the University of that City. 8vo. pp. 23. London.

**R**ELIGIOUS controversies and their causes form one of the most perplexing and discouraging topics that can engage the attention of a serious thinker. The relations of man, in his individual capacity, to moral order, to God, and to eternity, press upon and overwhelm us. The questions which arise out of those relations, are of vast extent and unlimited importance. The native powers of man have toiled to answer them, and have toiled for ages in vain. In a conjuncture so important, for interests so great, under a necessity so urgent, Divine Revelation steps in and offers her welcome aid. Now, it might be expected that our difficulties would come to an end. The very design of Revelation is to dissipate the doubts and darkness which could not otherwise be removed; to give certainty of information respecting objects beyond the range of intuition, observation, or experiment in the present life; and to afford to the distressed soul of man a bed of sure repose, in the contemplation of God's righteous judgement and a retributive eternity. God has spoken: he has shewn us what is good,—what he requires of us,—how man may be just before his Maker,—how he who is worthy of condemnation may attain pardon,—how the impure in heart and life may become holy,—how the fallen sinner may be raised to salvation and the inheritance of a heavenly life. Yet,—O painful confession, and truth more bitter still!—yet, the end is not answered: the darkness still broods; the old questions are produced again, and an immense number is added to them; controversies, instead of being allayed, are multiplied; difficulties, instead of being for ever exterminated, are aggravated: and, in explaining the records of Revelation, men differ at every step, contest every point, and leave not a single principle of fact or doctrine, duty or hope, in undisturbed possession of our minds. Can this be?

If the differences among Christians, multifarious and endless

as they may be, related only to points which did not hazard the process of restoration, which did not impede, or threaten, or make impossible the acquisition of holiness and happiness, the perplexity would not weigh so heavily upon our spirits. But this refuge is denied. All the principles on which rest the obligations of duty, the honour of the Divine government, and the efficacy of restorative mercy, are questioned, rejected, or perverted in all imaginable and unimaginable ways.

Or, if the grounds of objection to the most vital doctrines of revelation were so palpably unfair, that every man of tolerable intelligence could see through their sophistry, and have no difficulty in pronouncing them the offspring of insincerity, the burden would be much alleviated. But, though in many cases, far more than some persons are aware of, the indications are discoverable, of the criminal prejudice, the dishonest mental dealing, "the carnal mind, which is enmity against God," we cannot trace these in every instance; and where their signs do not appear, we are not invested with a right to charge them: we are not cognizant of the secrets of the heart.

Or, if the fact so stood, that we plainly saw only the ignorant, the profligate, the proud, the indeavour, the men who have manifestly no taste for holy sentiments, holy feelings, or holy practice, as the advocates on one side; while the friends of an opposite class of doctrines were uniformly found to be, not only the best informed, but the most upright in morals, the most pure in all virtue, and the most humble and affectionate in the exercises of spiritual devotion; we should have a resource most welcome from our perturbed and anxious feelings. But this relief is far from us.

What then remains? How can a sincere and humble Christian find security for his faith, and satisfaction to his conscience, in embracing any one system of doctrines on the most momentous topics, those which refer to his own deliverance from evil, and his attainment of everlasting blessedness with God?

Some advise us to seek this happy state in *ignorance*. They recommend, as the escape from difficulty and doubt, the careful exclusion of all statements but on one side, the prevention of all knowledge but that which has been previously catered out for us by some one or more, who assume the right to judge and determine, not for themselves only, but for as many as they can persuade to submit to them. Many look with horror upon the popish tenets, that *ignorance is the mother of devotion*, and that *the most implicit faith in what the Church believes, without knowing what it is, is the most meritorious*; while yet they adopt and inculcate the same principle, to a length just so far as is convenient to themselves.

But can that be true faith, which makes its bed in ignorance,



where the means of knowledge exist; and which then must be a voluntary and cherished ignorance? Can that be true faith which dreads examination, which flies from a strict and careful scrutiny of its grounds and its operations? Real faith is the belief of THE TRUTH. Truth is necessary and unchangeable. It can never suffer by being brought to light. On the contrary, its immortal foundations can only be demonstrated the more clearly, if all adventitious incrustations are unsparingly cleared out of the way. It is impossible for the case to be any other than that, the more completely its evidences are laid bare, the more clearly they will be demonstrated to be impregnable.

To this whole state of things, we humbly submit, there is no applicable remedy beyond the penitent acknowledgment of human corruption, the deep-felt adoration of the Divine Majesty, lowly and fervent prayer, and renewed fidelity in diligent investigation till we have found a solid and rational satisfaction. In this course, it will be useful to reflect, that the discoveries of revelation were not designed to act mechanically; that the prejudices which would dislike and oppose the testimony of Divine Truth, have been distinctly foretold and provided against; and that the whole is resolvable into the great fact, which is the basis of the whole revealed doctrine concerning the necessity and the manner of redemption,—a deep-seated, versatile, and ever active disloyalty in the human mind, against the moral perfections and government of the Deity. Common as is the observation, and unwelcome as it is to many, it must not be left out of the account, that much of what men call virtue, a large measure of social integrity and beneficence, of personal restraint and decorum, often arises from motives purely selfish, and is co-existent with a very high degree of disaffection, and even malignity, against *real* goodness, the essential amiableness of the Divine nature, eternal and unalterable HOLINESS. There is a “deceivableness of unrighteousness,” which is of most subtle and mighty operation, and which leads men to “receive not the love of the truth, that they may be saved.” The inspired teachings of the apostles were as much opposed by persons who professed to be Christians, in their own day, as in modern times. Even then, there were “false teachers,—persons who transformed themselves into (the semblance and authority of the) apostles of Christ,—privily bringing in (αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας) destructive principles, denying the Lord that bought them.”

These reflections have been awakened in our minds by the larger work at the head of this article, and the school to which it belongs, the learned and plausible, but thinly disguised infidelity, of the German Neologists:—we are unwilling to concede to them the name of Rationalists. That work is, we apprehend,

the most considerable of all in its class, that have been translated into our language. The translation, remarkably in contrast to some late professed versions of German theological books, is executed with consummate ability, by one who thoroughly understands the subject, and who conveys in a faithful and lively manner the spirit of the book. This translator is understood to be a distinguished young clergyman of Cambridge, the Rev. Connop Thirlwall. The Introductory Dissertation, which he has prefixed, is indeed a fine specimen of talent and research; and it cannot but the more excite our concern, that he has not directed his powers to the answering of objections, the removal of difficulties, and the counteracting of the pernicious tendency of the book. This we believe that he might have done; the interests of TRUTH required it at his hands. Truth, with its proper evidence, is all that we wish for. Surely then, as a Christian, he was bound to undertake the labour, tedious and toilsome as it might have been, and, as a clergyman, it behoved him to remember his ordination vow, that he would 'be ready, with  
' all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and  
' strange doctrines contrary to God's word, and to use both pub-  
' lic and private monitions and exhortations,—as need shall re-  
' quire, and occasion be given.'

The "Critical Essay on the Gospel of Luke" was published by Schleiermacher in 1817, at the time when he, with De Wette, Wegscheider, Gesenius, and Röhr, were playing the first parts in the tragedy of Neologism. The Author has been not inactive in his day. Since he was thirty years old, in 1798, he has published several volumes of sermons and various disquisitions on theological, ecclesiastical, and critical subjects. None of these have we had the opportunity of seeing; but we have reason to fear that their general character is what we have already intimated.

The subject to which this volume relates, is the origination of the Gospels, particularly the first three. The Bishop of Peterborough's Dissertation, annexed to his Translation of Michaelis's Introduction, in 1801, first brought the subject fully before the minds of English readers. The early Protestant commentators and divines, with the exception of Grotius, had scarcely adverted to the subject, or had contented themselves with occasional and brief notices, such as a slight examination must have ascertained to be quite unsatisfactory. Towards the beginning of the eighteenth century, Le Clerc, Mill, and Wetstein proposed their opinions on this question; and in a following period, it was investigated with great assiduity by Michaelis and many others of the German critics, and in our own country chiefly by the late Dr. Henry Owen. But it is during the last forty

years that the most laborious diligence has been employed upon it, by the late estimable Dr. Niemeyer, by Eichhorn, and by many others of the German Bible-scholars.

Whoever reads a Greek Harmony of the Gospels, must be struck with these facts: that Matthew, Mark, and Luke frequently recite the same facts, but particularly speeches of our Lord, in the same words;—that often there is such a variation of the words, but conservation of the sense, as usually takes place when two persons translate into one language a passage from a foreign book;—that still more instances occur, in which the variation is much less than must necessarily be in the case just supposed, while yet the conformity is not perfect, as in the first class of instances;—that in some cases, the differences are very considerable, referring to words spoken, actions performed, and the consecution of events;—and that in other cases, the variations are such as appear irreconcilable by any method that ingenuity can devise, so that we are driven to the conclusion, that some of the Evangelists have erred in the dates of events, the combination of materials, and other minute circumstances, merely of an outward and mechanical kind, and which have no effect whatever on the certainty of their narrative, or its grand use for religious instruction.

There are, indeed, some persons who suppose that all and singular the sentences and words, in the very order in which they stand through the whole of the Gospel Records, were literally dictated by the Holy Spirit; and that the Evangelists had no other part to perform than that of mechanical hand-writers. Those persons, therefore, do not shrink from maintaining, that the variations, equally with the coincidences, even those which apparently are the most insusceptible of being bent to reconciliation, all proceeded from one and the same source, the verbal prescription of the Spirit of truth. We must leave the advocacy of this opinion to those who think themselves able to maintain it.

The chief questions are, Did one or two of the first three Evangelists transcribe from the other? Or did they all make use of some one common document, taking from it more or less of their respective matter? Or had they a variety of such common documents? The affirmative of each of these positions has been maintained by different writers; and each has attempted to shew the impossibility of any theory being true, except his own.

Perhaps we shall be forgiven, if we here borrow a few paragraphs from lectures on this subject, which have been delivered more than twenty years ago, in one of the Dissenting Colleges near the metropolis.

‘Wherever the apostles went to preach the gospel, we find them attentive to two great objects; the first, the conversion of men to the



faith and obedience of their Redeemer ; the second, the instruction and edification of those who had been already converted.

‘ In discharging the duties of this second class, the first Christian teachers must have experienced such a state of things as I shall now take the liberty of supposing. The new converts could not but feel themselves deeply interested to inquire for all attainable information relative to the character, conduct, miracles, and discourses of the Lord Jesus. With such requests, the apostolic instructors would undoubtedly be disposed to comply, to the utmost of their power and opportunity. We have in Acts xx. 35, a reference to information of this kind, but which is not recorded by any one of the Evangelists.

‘ The relations thus given by the apostles, would be of various length, and would comprehend one or more anecdotes or discourses ; as the judgement of the relators, under the inspiring guidance of the Holy Spirit, dictated the propriety of the selection, in application to the circumstances of those for whose benefit it was imparted.

‘ These relations would be justly esteemed of the highest value ; on account of the important and interesting nature of the matter, and on account of the promised influence of the Holy Spirit, to bring to the recollection of the disciples “all things whatsoever Jesus had said unto them.”

‘ Within the immediate confines of Judæa, the apostles would usually deliver their discourses in Syro-Chaldaic, the language of the country ; but, in other places, they commonly spoke the Alexandrian Greek.

‘ Though it is not probable that any of the apostles, during the first few years of their laborious duties, committed to writing any large accounts ; they might, upon request, write down such or such a particular relation or discourse of their Divine Master. Or, perhaps more probably, some one of their hearers wrote from their mouths those relations. In each of their various audiences of converts, it may surely be presumed, that one person, at least, was competent to perform this service for himself and his companions in the faith.

‘ It is further a matter of reasonable presumption, that such memorials, records, fragments, or whatever we may call them, would be presented by the writer to the apostle from whose oral instructions they had been derived ; with a request for revision and correction. Thus, these detached portions of narrative, conversation, or continued discourse, would obtain most justly the sanction of apostolic authority ; and would be preserved, read, circulated, copied, and revered accordingly.

‘ To the Evangelists Mark and Luke, such fragments would be of immense value. It may be presumed, that they diligently collected them, that they were able fully to appreciate their claims to authenticity, and that they introduced those which they knew to be of indubitable authority into their respective narratives ; and some of them might, with equally good reason, be inserted by Matthew in his original Syro-Chaldaic Gospel. Luke adverts, in plain terms, to a plurality of sources from which he had deduced his information, when he says, that “those who from the beginning had been eye-witnesses and attendants of the Word, had delivered” their declarations ; and that

he himself (παρηκολουθηκότι ἀναθίει πᾶσι ἀκριβῶς) "had diligently traced up all from the first." When the translator of Matthew's Gospel into Greek, whether that was himself or any other person, found any of these fragments which corresponded with passages in his original, he would act properly by availing himself of them, and transcribing them into his version. This conjecture applies, of course, to the Greek fragments, which may be presumed to have been the more numerous of the two classes.

'The inference from these positions is; that, where we find the continued verbal agreements in the three or in two of these sacred writers, we are reading an authentic Greek fragment, which each possessed and faithfully inserted in his work; but that, where we find the coincidences which are not strictly verbal, but lie in the collocation of sentences and members of sentences, each of the writers had before him a copy of the same Syro-Chaldaic fragment, and translated it into Greek for his own purpose.'

Upon this general basis, we understand that the Professor whose words we have borrowed, conceives that both the agreements and the disagreements, and all the other phenomena of the case, may be accounted for; so far as it is in our power to account for them. Now it is remarkable that this, or something very much like it, is the essential part of Dr. Schleiermacher's hypothesis; but it is carried out by him into so many and complicated combinations, that no brief limits can suffice to furnish a comprehensive idea of its applications and their results. He also differs in making it a part of his supposition, that the applications of the industrious first writers were not usually to the apostles themselves, but to other persons who might be able to furnish the desired information.

'On the one hand', he says, 'these persons had less courage to apply to the apostles, who were busily engaged in the greater work of preaching and propagating Christianity, except in particular cases, on an extraordinary inducement; and rather sought out friends and hearers of the second class: on the other hand, they of course directed their researches principally to places from which they might hope for the most abundant harvest, that is, to Capernaum and Jerusalem. Hence, the portions of the three Gospels which are common to them, consist chiefly of incidents from the different periods of Christ's stay at Capernaum, and his last stay at Jerusalem.' p. 110.

Our Author distributes the Gospel of Luke into four main divisions, which he considers to be separated by sufficient lines of demarcation, as well as distinguished by their internal characters. These are:

'I. Accounts of the interval preceding the public life of Jesus, comprised in ch. i. and ii. II. Several accounts, more or less closely connected together, of actions and discourses of Jesus; the time, with the exception of that part which relates to his baptism by John, not

being precisely marked ; the place, with the same exception, Capernaum or its neighbourhood : ch. iii. 1. to ix. 49. The III<sup>d</sup> contains similar narratives, but relating mostly to a journey of Christ to Jerusalem. The last (IV.) treats, generally in a more connected manner, of the last days of Christ, his sufferings and death, and his resurrection and ascension.—The first division, in substance at least, Luke has in common with Matthew, but not with Mark. The second, with few exceptions, not only in substance, but also in the mode of narration, he has in common with both. The third division, with some insignificant and in part doubtful exceptions, contains incidents and discourses peculiar to Luke : and indeed this portion, though I should not be inclined', says the Author, ' to close it exactly at ch. xviii. 14, has been taken by others for a distinct composition, which Luke met with and incorporated in his Gospel. The fourth again is, in substance, but not in the same degree as the second in form, common to all three, with the exception, however, of the greatest part of the narratives relating to the resurrection.' pp. 19, 20.

That the contents of ch. i. 5.—ii. 52, were originally a separate document, or rather two documents, one derived probably from the family of Zacharias, and the other from that of Joseph, we have long thought. The strong Hebraistic style, forming such a contrast with Luke's introductory paragraph, and the undeniable poetical structure of the Hymns of Zacharias and Mary, render it next to impossible to doubt that the original composition of the narrative was in Syro-Chaldaic, and that of the hymns in pure Hebrew. So far we can go with our Author, and many who have preceded him. But when, to accomplish the long-felt desideratum of harmonizing this narrative with that in Matthew i. 18.—ii. 23, he brings out the supposition, that certain parts in the *narrative* of each evangelist are *poetical allegories*, we feel the ground shake under our feet. What reason could exist, for putting into this dress such facts as the spotlessness of Mary's character, the miraculous conception, the sufferings of the Messiah, and the designed admission of the Gentiles to the blessings of his reign? And are not these portions as closely connected with the succession of the narrative, as any relation of facts could be? It is clearly impossible to construe Luke ii. 39, in any other way than of a return to Nazareth *immediately* after what had taken place in the temple. To introduce a return from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, thence the journey into Egypt, the abode there, the return into Palestine, and the settling in Nazareth, events occupying probably two years, between the first and the second clauses in the verse of Luke, appears to us totally inadmissible ; unless we would sanction an arbitrariness of interpretation which would sap the foundations of all certainty in the word of God, or in any writing whatsoever. But we see no just prejudice against the supposition, that, after a period, Joseph with



his family might have occasion to repair to Bethlehem, and so might be providentially sojourning there when the oriental Magi came in search of the infant king. That many and wide chasms occur in every one of the Gospel histories, is evident to every eye. Indeed, each of them is much more properly to be denominated a collection of anecdotes, having a general relation to the order of time, but not a minutely anxious position of chronology, the writers being guided in the selection by much higher views than the forms of regular history. We are not insensible to the difficulties which present themselves in any attempt to combine the narratives of Matthew and Luke; but we think it much more rational to confess our inability to construct such a harmony, and to impute it to the irremediable want of some historical notices, which, did we possess them, we should find to satisfy all our wishes, than to violate the rules of historical and literary criticism by rejecting either the one or the other narrative, or by introducing into the thread of plain relation, patches of parable or instructive fable. The first clause in Matthew ii. 1, may in strict fairness be rendered as by Michaelis, "After Jesus was born, in the time of the reign of Herod, at Bethlehem, in the land of Judæa"; or, by Van Ess, "Since now Jesus was born", &c.; or, by the late Dr. Stolz of Bremen, himself too much tinctured with Neologism, "After the birth of Jesus", &c. We have no solid grounds for considering the introductory chapters of either Matthew or Luke as not genuine: the contrary has been abundantly proved in a work well deserving the critical reader's attention; "A Vindication of the Authenticity of the Narratives in the First Two Chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, by a Layman; London, 1822":—of which we gave a large review in our Vol. XXI. New Series, pp. 328—340; April, 1824. Dr. Olshausen (in his *Versuch über die Echtheit*, &c., justly recommended by the Translator of Schleiermacher, p. li.), after having summed up the results of his minute and masterly investigation, proving the genuineness of each of the Gospels in detail, remarks: 'The circumstance is particularly deserving of being considered, that we no where find any one or other of the Gospels *insulated*, but *always* in their *collected* form. With respect to Clemens of Rome, Barnabas, and Ignatius, we are obliged to leave it undecided whether they used our Gospels or not; we have no grounds of determination either way. But *all the other* early Christian writers had the *collection* of Gospels: of none of them can it be shewn, that he had only one or another.' p. 422.

We shall attempt to convey some idea of Schleiermacher's opinions, and his manner of conveying them, by a few selected extracts. The whole discussion on this single point, is far too long for admission into our pages. Our readers will candidly

bear in mind this circumstance; at the same time that we shall employ sincere care that our extracts, though necessarily garbled, may not convey an unjust impression.

What we read, ch. ii. 22—40, respecting the presentation of the child in the Temple, which was combined with the purification of his mother, seems also to have been originally related and committed to writing, without connexion with the preceding passage: for, at the end, mention is made of the return to Nazareth, just as though the parents had come from that place to Jerusalem, without notice being taken by a single word of their residence up to that time in Bethlehem, which would nevertheless have been so easy and natural. This narrative, therefore, knows nothing of that residence. Only I would not, on that account, understand the surprise of Mary at the language of Simeon, as implying that she herself did not know yet who her son was. For it is not, certainly, as the only sign which she received, but as one among several, that this incident can have been related. And notwithstanding the marvellous, of which it too has its share, it bears a purely historical stamp. For it is a circumstance too natural for a poetical fiction, that Simeon, who, filled with expectations of the Messiah, had probably also prayed for a sign, when it had, we know not in what manner, been granted to him, breaks out, in the first instance, only to himself, and without taking notice of the parents, into an enthusiastic apostrophe, and only addresses himself to them upon observing their surprise. And, should any one even be inclined to suppose this also to have been originally a poetical and symbolical representation, why should the author, together with Simeon, have introduced Anna, who is not even made to answer any poetical purpose? and with an accuracy of description moreover, in comparison with which the principal character is far more negligently delineated? This trace leads us immediately farther, and indicates clearly enough, that this narrative also is not to be referred to Mary and Joseph, to whom Anna and Simeon were alike unknown; but to one who obtained it, directly or indirectly, from the lips of this Anna who is so accurately described.

Thus then, by an apparently gradual annexion of several detached narratives, committed to writing independently of each other, to a piece which was originally composed, not as an historical narrative, but as a poem, did the first division of this Gospel, according to these indications, take its rise. Now, if we compare, without any prepossession, this and the corresponding portion in Matthew, we have two parallel successions of narratives, [yet not] parallel in the stricter sense of the word, inasmuch as they have no single point (that is, in this case, no entire fact) in common; and also inasmuch as they are not at all supplemental to each other, but, on the contrary, the corresponding members of the two successions almost entirely exclude each other. Hence, then, if in any point the narrative of the one evangelist is correct, that of the other, so far as it relates to the same epoch, cannot be so. In the first place, if our history of the annunciation is true, then are the doubts of Joseph and their decision as related by Matthew inconceivable.—The two narratives in Luke, of the shepherds at Bethlehem and the presentation in the Temple, do not ac-

cord with the two in Matthew, of the adoration of the Magi and the massacre at Bethlehem.—Finally, the two successions of narratives rest on a totally different tradition one from the other, as must strike every person who impartially considers each by itself. Luke supposes every where, that, before the birth of Jesus, which took place only accidentally at Bethlehem, Joseph and Mary lived at Nazareth. Matthew, on the contrary, knows nothing of any accidental cause of the birth happening at Bethlehem; and clearly supposes that Joseph, but for the intervention of some particular circumstances, would have returned to Judea after his flight; and therefore manifestly takes that, and not Galilee, to have been his usual place of abode. All attempts to reconcile these two contradictory statements seem only elaborate efforts of art, to which one should not needlessly resort, or indeed should rather give no explanation at all. How then? Are we, in general, to pronounce the one series true, and the other false? Or, how are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulty? In such a sweeping sentence as that, we should feel ourselves the less justified, as we have found in our series in Luke, a portion which, being presented in a poetical rather than an historical shape, immediately resigns the contest; while another, which bears in itself evident marks of artless and unadulterated tradition, will not yield its ground. We must therefore separate them, and examine them apart. In the first place, then, we shall observe, that our account of the annunciation can make no pretension to be admitted as history, in comparison with Matthew's relation of the scruples entertained by Joseph, and the mode of their removal. All that we shall have to compare with the narrative in Matthew, will be the traditional foundation of the poetical piece in our evangelist; namely, that expectations had been excited in an extraordinary manner in Mary, previously to the birth of Jesus, that she was to bear the son of God. Now this is easily reconcileable with Matthew's narrative. Mary might even, as it is natural to suppose, have communicated to Joseph the ground of her expectations; and still the latter, whatever degree of love and confidence, of piety and hope in the Messiah, we may attribute to him, may, if these expectations were grounded on signs not perfectly clear, or distinctly connected with actual events, still, I say, he may have fluctuated in his faith: and the nearer the necessity approached of coming to a final determination, have inclined the more to the side of doubt. We may, then, the more securely leave Matthew's narrative in the wise indefiniteness to which it confines itself: the traditional foundation of our poetical account of the annunciation repels all the presumptuous interpretations with which vulgar hands would soil the sacred veil which they cannot lift. And precisely so far ought we to advance in investigations of this nature.' pp. 39—50.

What does Dr. S. mean by this burst of seeming veneration and humility? If it were sincere, we should say it was becoming and just; but we must say likewise, that the lesson needed to have been inculcated earlier, and to have been observed more frequently. But if it were 'an under-tone of irony,' its pro-



fane, deceptive, and mischievous character cannot be deplored too deeply or condemned too strongly.

‘As to the second part of our series, we must contend, that the narratives in our evangelist, of the birth of Jesus and his presentation in the Temple, bear, in the main, a purely historical stamp: but is this likewise the case with those of Matthew? Has not the account of the Magi, in its inmost essence, a completely *symbolical* character; tending, while it represents Jesus as immediately recognized by the heathen, to establish the right of Christianity to extend beyond the limits of Judaism; and, in the persecution of the infant Messiah, to which the king of the Jews was urged by this very homage of the strangers, prefiguring the rejection of Christianity by the nation peculiarly exasperated by the participation granted to the heathen? Hence too, the interweaving of this narrative with passages from the Old Testament. And so, this symbolical narrative, the origin of which is probably to be looked for on the Eastern confines of Palestine, might have been brought into an artificial combination with a real fact: for that massacre of the infants can scarcely be a mere fiction. Here then, Matthew, as having introduced some poetical elements into his narrative, would recede, and Luke would keep the historical field. Can it at all lessen the credibility of the two evangelists, that each admitted into his history some passages not purely historical? Certainly not; with a candid judge who reflects, in the first place, that all this serves still only as a *prelude* to the proper subject of the history, which was the *Public Life* of Jesus; in the next place, that, in the sacred books [of the Old Testament] which our authors had most before their eyes, and whence they and their contemporaries, from whom they received their accounts, and for whom they wrote, drew their chief intellectual food,—that, in these books, poetry and history are nowhere kept quite distinct; that they, therefore, neither could have nor needed that discriminating sense which is peculiar to us; and lastly, how far, notwithstanding, their purity of feeling has kept them from the extravagance and romance of the exploded Gospels, the compilers or authors of which were possessed with the confused spirit of Rabbinical Judaism. This contrast upholds our Canonical Evangelists in their just authority, and shews us the spirit in which they proceeded in its dignity and sanctity.’ pp. 50, 51.

To the question which Dr. S. answers by his ‘certainly not,’ we must put a different kind of pause. Whatever of alleviation or plausibility he may conceive to be in his subsequent arguings, (and we admit they are not frivolous,) we are compelled to say, that poetical fancies, allegories, *mythi*, or whatever else persons may choose to call them, cannot be introduced *as continuous parts* of plain narrative, without either ignorance or a want of good faith. It is a very different thing, when an historian quotes such materials, as vouchers or corroborants of particular facts: in such cases, the distinction is broadly marked; and such do occur in both the Pentateuch and the other Historical Books

of the Old Testament. But if, which we fear, the Author's reference is to the histories of the creation and the fall, and the various communications of God to the patriarchs and the prophets, we enter our solemn demur against both his assumptions and his conclusion.

This notion of a poetical investing, the Author also applies to other parts of the evangelical history. Concerning the bloody sweat in our Lord's agony, and the angel strengthening him, he writes :

' The most probable supposition, however, appears to me to be, that he has taken a poetical image for an historical fact, and so inserted it in this place : for that these moments, described by himself as trying, were at a very early period embellished in hymns with angelic apparitions, is not improbable. [In] the rending of the veil—and the opening of the graves,—we shall rather recognize the same poetical origin.—That such poetical images, when isolated and detached from their context, the darkness and earthquake presenting so easy a transition, might be taken by some for historical facts, especially where the limits between poetry and prose are so wavering, is very conceivable.'  
pp. 301—306.

After these passages, it will not surprise our readers to be informed, that there are many paragraphs, and some where the essence of the sentiment is not objectionable, disfigured with a hastiness of assertion and an irreverent flippancy of manner and insinuation, which ill become a minister of the gospel, or any Christian, or any man of ordinary good sense. Amidst the mass of intricate, ingenious, bold, startling, and sometimes almost profane speculations which fill the larger part of these pages, we find some valuable observations and hints of interpretation, which deserve to be found in better company. For example ; in Luke xii. 48, "the servant who knew not" his Lord's will, is explained as one 'who had not received any specific orders from the master.' p. 198. On the parable of the unjust and crafty steward, ch. xvi. 1—8, are some suggestions original and far-fetched, yet meriting consideration.

' The master represents the Romans, the steward the publicans, the debtors the Jewish nation ; and Christ means to say, If the publicans, in their calling and with that which they acquire in it, and consequently by means of a violent and iniquitous state of things, which is therefore with reason termed "the mammon of unrighteousness," show themselves mild, indulgent, and beneficent towards their nation, the Romans, the enemies of the nation, will themselves in their hearts praise them : and so you have all reason to allow them beforehand (with a view to the time when this state of things is to cease, 'when the mammon of unrighteousness shall fail, [reading with some weighty authorities, ἐκ λήπης,] and when, according to the expectation universally entertained, with the end of the Roman dominion, "the kingdom

of God" was to begin,) the right of citizens in that kingdom, and so to admit them into the "eternal habitations." In this way Christ vindicates those publicans who were his disciples and who acted like Zaccheus; but adds, that no such claim could be made by those who had not, with their worldly substance and in their foreign service, shewn themselves trust-worthy and true to their countrymen.' pp. 213, 214.

After a chain of observations, ingenious and striking, though some of them have a questionable air, on Luke xvi. 16, 17, compared with Matt. v. 18, xi. 12, 13, the Author has this sentence, which, like some others of his general remarks, conveys a lesson of which it was eminently incumbent on him to have made a self-application.

'Since then the construction here attempted, points out a satisfactory connexion in general, I satisfy myself as to particular difficulties (which even this interpretation still leaves), by supposing that Christ meant only to intimate what upon a single hint must have been more intelligible to his immediate hearers than to us; and I only derive from these difficulties a more lively conviction of the fidelity and self-denying exactness of the reporter.' p. 218.

On a variety of other occasions, Dr. S. unravels very happily the entangled thread of circumstantial difficulties, and places in a new and striking point of view, the exquisite fidelity of the sacred writers. We may point out his illustrations of ch. v. 17—25; xvii. 20—37; xviii. 9—14; 31—34; xx. 41—44; xxii. 7—23; 35—38. We can make room for only a part of the last of these instances.

This 'addition is quite peculiar to our Gospel, and related as imperfectly as the preceding. The connexion is easily restored, by combining what Jesus says at v. 35, with v. 30, and inserting the whole supplement between that and the following verse. The narrator passed over it there, for the very reason that it was addressed not to Peter, but to all; and it only occurs to him on the question respecting the swords. If we would imagine the conversation to have taken place after the prediction of Peter's fall, then many intermediate links must be wanting, or even a new occasion; so that, at all events, the narrative would not be connected. Hence, in this instance also, the origin we suppose best explains all the phenomena. Moreover, the very obscurity of the passage evinces most clearly, according to my impression, the genuineness and originality of this addition. For it is too obvious, that it was not Christ's intention to ask about swords, in order to set himself in a posture of defence against the approaching attack; for then how should two have been enough? Here then, certainly, had the narrative passed through several hands, an explanation, though but invented, would have crept in; as, in a connected narrative, the ambiguity would probably disappear of itself.' p. 299.

The idolized principle under the influence of which this book



has been composed, with so much sharp-sightedness and laborious scrutinizing, is what the Author calls *Historical and Psychological Views*; in other words, a perpetual collation of attested facts with the methods of apprehension and feeling natural to mankind, or what, in our country, we usually call the Laws of Mental Association. We do not deny the fundamental truth and utility of this principle: but we conceive, that it is a most difficult and exquisitely delicate task, to make use of it, especially in relation to historical facts. He who applies his notions concerning the association of ideas and the government of motives, to the details of attested facts far removed from us in place, time, and the habits of mankind; and who, in such application, takes upon him to contradict the testimony which he admits to be honest and sincere; ought certainly to make sure of one thing in all the construction of his theories,—that *he possesses a PERFECT knowledge of ALL the circumstances and all the complexities of external fact and mental susceptibility, that could influence the case.* If a single element or atom be wanting, or be not estimated at its true value, it will be like the misplacing of a sign at the beginning of a long algebraic operation: the result will be infinitely far from the truth. Where then is the man, where is the creature, who possesses this perfect knowledge?—Yet, it is the essential principle of most Neological speculations upon the interpretation of scripture and the doctrines of Christianity, to determine, not *how things were*, as declared by the appropriate testimony, but how, upon such data as the operator chooses to assume, they might have been, and ought to have been, and therefore *must have been.* Take any portion of history; the life of Luther, for instance, or the reign of Elizabeth; analyse the circumstances of every recorded fact; dissect every member in the true style of Schleiermacher's microscopic anatomy; and then new-model the history, with implicit faith in your laws of association and your rules of Psychology!—Or, let a man write a narrative of his own actions for a week, with an unsuspecting frankness, with a business-like brevity, such as is the manner of the evangelical records; let him then apply his psychological instruments; let him bring out all the tools forged in Kant's and Fichte's metaphysical shops; let him ferret out the due quantity of omissions and contradictions; let him work his materials as his masters have shewn him;—what shape will now his honest journal assume? Will a single fact remain without material alteration?

O then, what folly; for man to set up his post by God's pillar;—to bring his laws of mind and philosophy of moral action, not for *illustration* only, which is fairly within the province, but for sovereign dictation over the domain of God's dealings with man!—And these are the doings of those who call themselves

*Rationalists.* Surely, of all beings in nature, they lack a name!

With how serene a front, with how commanding a voice, does TRUE REASON say, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these last times spoken unto us by HIS SON.—How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which, having been at the first spoken by the Lord, has been confirmed unto us by them that heard him, God also bearing them witness with signs and miracles and diverse powers and distributions of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will?"

Yet, we are happy to say, Dr. Schleiermacher does not deny miracles. Besides other intimations affirmative on this point, we find him, under the apparent recollection of the wild arbitrariness in this way of Paulus and De Wette and their fellow-labourers, declaring,—‘the attempt to explain away the miraculous, is always fruitless.’ p. 27. He even allows of a real inspiration in the composition of the Holy Scriptures; though, how he would extricate himself from the contradiction which stares upon us, between the general spirit of his work and the following passage, we are not able to divine.

‘If the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the composition of the Scriptures, is held to be of a specific kind, distinct from its working in the universal church, and from its agency in the disciples of Christ, there is always peculiar embarrassment in determining, on the one hand, in what it consisted in the case of the historical writings, and, on the other hand, to what persons it ought to be confined. By the view here proposed, this operation is divided; and that is the only difference, in this respect, between it and the common view. There is, first, the agency of the Divine Spirit in those who were witnesses of the events, and heard and reported the speeches of Christ. By this they were enabled to apprehend every thing from the right point of view, and to report it in such a manner as to render the truth of the matter obvious, on the application of that degree of attention, which whatsoever is ascribed in a higher sense to the Divine Spirit more especially demands: and of this agency I have taken pains to search the traces, and to point them out more carefully than is commonly done. In the second place, there is the agency of the Spirit in the person who collected and digested. For, in ascribing the result to human investigation and selection, I do not mean a technically critical process, which was foreign to those times and men; or that the governing principle could be any other than the Spirit of Christianity recognizing its own work.’ [—How we wish that the Author had explained what he means by this expression!—] ‘Now, if the compiler of our Gospel was one of whom it may seem doubtful whether, as he does not belong to the number of the Twelve, an extraordinary influence of the Spirit can with propriety be attributed to him; it is, at all events, safer that he should appear as the compiler and arranger only, not as the author, and that we should have to look for the first and largest portion of the

extraordinary agency, not in him, but only in those who stood in immediate connexion with the Redeemer, who therefore received from him continual emanations of the Divine Spirit, (and that at a time too early to distinguish between its ordinary and its extraordinary operations,) and to whom the promise was given, that the Spirit should "shew them that which was of Christ, and should guide them into all truth." John, xvi. 13, 14. And thus, the authority of our writer appears, to me at least, to gain instead of losing, when his work is referred to earlier works of original and inspired witnesses of the facts. *Author's Preface*, pp. iv—vi.

We must now lay down this volume, having said, we apprehend, quite enough to satisfy our readers; though there are many other topics rising out of it, upon which, had we space and time, we might not uselessly enlarge. In the Translator's Introduction, occupying 154 pages, there are many passages of importance: but we must content ourselves with merely mentioning, that he bears a decisive testimony to the evidence which establishes the positive agency of the Holy Spirit in the composition of the New Testament, though we find something obscure and ambiguous in his manner of expression; that he points out the verbal coincidences in the First Three Gospels; that he makes some good objections to Eichhorn's hypothesis; and that his observations are peculiarly valuable on the "Gospel according to the Hebrews", and that described as having been adopted by Marcion.

But now we have a far more agreeable task to perform. Two or three years ago, some vague intimations occurred to us, exciting a hope that Dr. Schleiermacher's mind had been brought to perceive a new evidence, force, and beauty in evangelical truth, and was throwing the weight of his character and talents into the scale of vital religion. This welcome intelligence has been recently confirmed to us by a general assurance, on the competency of which we have reason to rely; but we regret our deficiency of ampler information. The Sermon, however, whose title is copied at the head of this article, furnishes some encouraging evidence that our hopes have not been fallacious. Indeed, the fact of his having been invited from Berlin to preach at the re-opening of the excellent Dr. Steinkopff's church (after a reparation to which his Majesty and the Dutchess of Clarence handsomely contributed), was no trifling ground of confidence that an important change had taken place in his theological and religious character, in comparison with that which we were long ago compelled to infer from quotations of Dr. S. which we had met with in German books.

Assuming the fact of this momentous alteration, we must be allowed to express the ardent wishes and just expectations of the truly *Evangelical Church*, that this learned and able writer



would now come forth in the spirit which actuated Saul of Tarsus, when he "preached the faith which once he [laboured to] destroy." The motives which should impel him, we would respectfully say, are very weighty; indeed, of authority irresistible. He is not pressed down by the load of years. No man is better qualified than he, to lay open the labyrinth of those dangerous errors which are comprehended under the usurped name of Rationalism. He has spent the best part of an active life in the heart of the camp, and in the most intimate relations with its greatest leaders. If we, in England, are under any misapprehensions with respect to the opinions which we impute to them, (and this to a certain extent is not improbable,) no man is more able than he to correct our mistakes and furnish us with faithful information. On the other hand, no person can so completely disclose the sources of error, lay open its windings, and administer the appropriate remedies, as one who has had so long and deep experience of its influence, who has been the victim of its fascinations, and who can tell the history of deliverance. If our voice can ever reach this eminently gifted man, we conjure him, for the love which he bears to his country and to mankind, for the deliverance of human souls from the most dangerous snares, for the happiness of his own mind, and for the glory of his Redeemer,—not to delay some effectual mode of conferring this benefit upon both the adversaries and the friends of genuine Christianity. A fair opportunity lies before him in the intimation given at the beginning of the Essay on Luke, of his intention to apply the same method of investigation to Luke's second book, the Acts of the Apostles, and to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. This is peculiarly incumbent on Dr. Schleiermacher, since he has been publicly represented by Wegscheider and others, as having addicted himself to the systematic use of orthodox phraseology, while he conceals under it meanings not obvious to plain Christians, but essentially different from the just use of the terms, and intended, by this most dishonest artifice, to help forward the denial of evangelical truth.

The Sermon before us is distinguished by a spirit of warm piety and judicious simplicity. It was heard with strong impressions of edification and delight; but, in its published form, it cannot be regarded as a fair specimen of the Author's pulpit composition. It was not written by himself, either before or after delivery; but was taken down by some friends, and only a small part of the copy could be submitted to his revision, on account of his short stay in London. The text is Eph. iv. 23. "Be renewed in the spirit of your minds." We can find room for only a few sentences, from the introduction.

‘ — These words of the Apostle were addressed to a Church of Christians,—to whom he gave testimony that they had been brought into a state of salvation, by the grace of God though faith in Jesus. But when he thus exhorted them to be renewed in the spirit of their mind, he did not refer to that original, mysterious operation of the Divine Spirit which is always the commencement of a new life; that which enables a man first to say of himself, “ Lord, I believe: help thou my unbelief!” When first he can with truth declare, “ I delight in the law of God, after the inward man. The will and the desire are present with me: but the perfection of performance falls short.” For, when the Apostle testifies of them that they were saved through faith in Jesus, it is certain that this work must have been wrought upon them.

‘ But the new and divine life which He, our Lord and Redeemer, has restored, needs a constant refreshing and renewing in the spirit of the mind. With the first turning of man to God in faith, begins the contest between the spirit and the flesh; and that the victory may be obtained, preserved, and increased, we require a constant renewing of the same spiritual power. It is of this that the apostle speaks in our text. And even so, when I speak before an assembly of Christians, I must regard them as persons who are subjects of that blessed operation of the Divine Spirit, by which Christ has begun to form them into his own likeness. But, to whatever degree of attainment they may have been brought, how mighty soever the spirit may be over the flesh, still there is a perpetual necessity for a progressive and never remitted renewing in the spirit of the mind. To this must every part and property of the Christian life contribute; the daily practice of the divine law, which admonishes every person of the circle of his personal duty and his social relations, and in which we have constant occasion to acknowledge how powerful in us is the Spirit of God, but yet how great is our own weakness. To this also must contribute the silent and serious self-examination, which should always occupy its proper intervals with the activity of life; and in which a man brings himself to the test, and ascertains his real state and character by looking into the mirror of the word of God. Also this our meeting together, and all the means of social exhortation and edification, though beginning in the affectionate relation of individual souls to each other, yet evince their most express and powerful and widely comprehensive influence in our Christian assemblies;—all these have an especial and decided share in this great work of a constant renovation of the believer’s mind.’ — Pp. 6, 7.

---

Art. IV. *Lettres sur l'Histoire de France.* . . . Letters on the History of France; designed as an Introduction to the Study of that History. By Augustin Thierry. 8vo. pp. 486. Paris. 1827.

THE Author of these spirited and singularly interesting Essays, is already advantageously known to our readers, by his able work on the Norman Conquest; and we feel much gratification in presenting to them a volume which bears the

decided signatures of the same hand. Original views of historical evidence, exclusive reference to the sources of history, minute investigation of its records, and extensive familiarity with its range and bearings, together with an ingenious application of his materials, and an admirable skill in availing himself of them for the purposes of illustration;—these high qualifications, somewhat injuriously blended with a tendency to generalize from insufficient data, and to support his views by evidence collateral, rather than specific, are as conspicuous in the present as in the former work. He is an antiquary of the best stamp, giving to antiquity its due weight, and nothing more; availing himself, to the utmost extent, of its information, and adopting its bold and broad manner, where the colour and character of events may require such an assimilation; but exhibiting, throughout, the impress of a vigorous and independent mind. He has, too, the rare faculty of giving a strong interest to details and discussions usually considered as sterile and repulsive; either by investing them with circumstantial attraction, or by employing them as evidence and illustration, bearing on some important principle that he is desirous of establishing, or on some exposure of error and false system, that he is putting forward against popular views of the nature and connexion of events. He is an excellent critic; not captious and snarling, although fearless and decided; rejecting everything that is offered on inadequate authority, but demanding from others nothing more than, in his own instance, he fully provides,—the grounds of assertion, all that is requisite for ascertaining the credibility of facts, and the means of weighing the positive and relative value of evidence.

Previously to the commencement of the present century, a history of France remained among the *desiderata* of French literature, although the materials for such a work were singularly rich and complete. Detached portions had been subjected to learned and judicious research, but no adequate attempt had been made to bring the whole series of events, with their connected circumstances, fairly before the public eye. The first essay of this kind was the publication, under royal patronage, in 1476, of the *Grandes Chroniques*, founded on records which had been carefully preserved in the Abbey of St. Denis. Like all compilations of the sort, it was unwieldy, ill-arranged, credulous, and indiscriminating. It affirmed the descent of the Gauls from the fugitives of Troy, and adopted the romance of Archbishop Turpin as veridical history. This voluminous affair was soon found to be unfit for general use; and one Master Nicholas Gilles, secretary to Louis XII., undertook its reduction within reasonable dimensions, and its accommodation to the notions and habits of the readers of his time. He was mortally addicted to moralizing, and somewhat excessive in the adoption



or invention of miracles. Although not much gifted with imaginative faculty, he now and then ventured on rather startling intimations. His description of Charlemagne is original. That monarch is represented as of 'lofty and striking presence, well-made in body, and eight feet high; his face, a span and a half long, with the forehead a foot wide; the upper part of his head (*le chef*) large, the nose small and flat, the eyes large, green, and sparkling, like carbuncles . . . He ate but little bread, and was fond of venison. He ate with ease at his dinner a quarter of a sheep, or a peacock, or a crane, or a couple of fowls, or a goose, or a hare, without reckoning the other comings-in and goings-out of the table.' This stupid book, destitute as it was of all pretension to either learning or talent, enjoyed, in its time, the highest popularity; and no fewer than sixteen editions appeared before the year 1617. A new and better taste at length took possession of the general mind, and the frigid reveries of Maître Nicole were dismissed to the land of forgetfulness. The revival of letters had called forth in Italy the exertions of enlightened and accomplished historians; and the fame of Machiavel and Guicciardini spread throughout Europe, kindling enthusiasm and awakening emulation. Bernard Girard, Lord of Haillan, felt or fancied himself called to vindicate the literary reputation of his country, and, after due labour, produced a history of France, that was at once to supply every deficiency, and to cast all rivalry into the shade. He wrote, exceedingly to his own satisfaction, after the manner of the ancients; interlards his narrative with speeches, discussions, and dialogues between imaginary speakers; and testifies an abundant and amusing contempt for the good old chroniclers. Gregory of Tours, Villehardouin, Joinville, Froissart himself, wither before the awful frown of the Seigneur du Haillan, who rates them soundly for their want of political profundity, and claims to himself the honours due to the first legitimate historian of France. In the eyes of this classical gentleman, these admirable narrators, with their vivid colouring, their rich and picturesque details, and their delightful simplicity of expression, were altogether an insignificant set; and it may not be amiss to exhibit the fine air of superiority with which he gives them the *coup de grace*. 'They amuse themselves,' he says, 'with repeating their own gossiping conversations, dialogues between one nobleman and another nobleman, between captains and soldiers, between this and t'other; the preparations for festivals, their arrangement, their ceremonies, their confectionary, their sauces, the dresses of lords and princes, the order in which they sat, their greetings, and other trumpery things and particularities, pleasant enough to talk about in common chat, but quite unconnected with history, which has to do only with

'state matters, such as the councils and enterprises of princes, with their causes, effects, and consequences; and with all this to mix fine sentences, that may admonish the reader of the profit to be derived from what he reads.' This classical performance, however, turned out a very paltry affair, and is now only remembered as having afforded hints and materials to the nobler genius of Mezeray. This able and high-minded writer, unhappily, neglected the fountain-head. He one day boasted, in the presence of the celebrated antiquary, Ducange, that he had never read a single old chronicler. Still, though he went no further back for his authorities than to Gilles and Du Haillan, his work is valuable. He took views of history that identified him with the cause of the people, and commended him to the displeasure of that extravagantly overrated minister, Colbert, who withdrew his pension. To make use of his own expressions, he undertook to *remind men of those ancient and natural rights against which there is no prescription*. As an historian, he is never profound, and frequently in error; but his opinions were decided and popular; his language was energetic and uncompromising; and he became, and long continued, the popular historian of his country.

The first writer of French history, who took up his task with correct notions of its object, and with just views of its proper derivation, was the Jesuit Daniel, who, while passing sentence on his predecessor, shewed how accurately he had seized on the right point from which to start in the composition of national story. 'Mezeray,' said he, 'either was ignorant of the sources, or neglected them.' For himself, he followed them scrupulously, adopting both the statements and the colouring of the original chronicles. He aimed successfully at the maintenance of that higher order of historical exactness which has reference to the due exhibition of habits and language, in all their mutations, and to the correct delineation of the great features of national character which distinguish successive periods. He was eminently impartial. Without troubling himself to inquire whether his frankness might please or provoke, he rejected the received notions on the subject of hereditary transmission; proved the elective character of the ancient succession; and demolished the false genealogies which had been forged to prove the royal origin of the third race of French kings. And he held firmly to this dignified impartiality, so long as he felt himself secure in his knowledge; but, unfortunately, he had taken a less lively interest in the investigations connected with more modern periods, and he suffered himself to be led astray by the *esprit de corps*. Respecting the Abbé Velly, during the latter half of the last century the popular historian of France, we shall hazard no opinion, seeing that we have but

slight acquaintance with either him or his continuators. M. Thierry shall speak for us, and at the same time solve an important question concerning the relative merit of the French annalists.

‘Which is the best history of France? This question, which is so often put to men who, like me, are engaged in historical researches, is far from being so simple as it may appear; many and very different answers might be made, in accommodation to the character and circumstances of the inquirer. Are you young; keenly bent on historical pursuits; able to encounter the exhaustion of long and continued study? Then open the Latin glossaries of the middle ages, and the Germanic glossaries, where are found the roots of all the modes of phraseology employed in the laws of the Franks: after this, read patiently, and without interruption, the long Collection of the Original Histories of Gaul and France, commenced by the Benedictine Fathers, and continued by the Institute. There is our history,—there it exists in greater truth, and more impressively, than it can ever be exhibited by men of the brightest genius or the most extensive learning. Are you unable to set apart years for this labour, and are you calm and impartial enough to make distinction between history and historians? Read Father Daniel; you will find him, what Voltaire found him, well-informed, exact, wise, and veridical. Do you, on the contrary, look more to the spirit than to the science of history; do you prefer to facts, a series of valuable inferences, and a generous indignation against injustice? Let Mezeray be your author. He is a worthy fellow: he narrates, without selection, both true and false. But when the exactions of ministers and the avarice of courtiers come across his pen, he takes a severe vengeance for the misery of those who toiled and exhausted themselves to answer those unrighteous extortions. As to Velly, a tasteless and unprincipled compiler, an ignorant and mawkish historian, leave him to those who can relish literary falsehood and political baseness.’

The French seem, in fact, to be getting thoroughly tired of these conventional historians, and a new school is with them, as with us, superseding the favourites of the old *régime*. Primary authorities are in vogue even among average readers, and extensive republications of the antique chroniclers have met with satisfactory encouragement. These worthies of the olden time have been effectively investigated by men of high talent; and the history of France will, henceforward, rest on foundations very different from the rotten props which have hitherto upheld the fabric. The calm, liberal, discriminating mind of Sismondi is engaged in the work; and he has already given us twelve volumes of exceeding value, displaying the same power of simplifying and combining, that gave such high interest to his History of the Italian Republics, but written with greater vigour. Guizot has published a volume of excellent Essays on the History of France, which we should have worked up



into the present article, but for the discovery that he deserves a separate notice, and that we should have quite enough to do with M. Thierry, apart from any additional matter. M. de Barante has trodden the same path with eminent success, although his *History of the Dukes of Burgundy* might have been coloured somewhat more warmly, without injury to the simplicity of the recital. Concerning the volume now before us, we shall suffer M. Thierry to give his own account of its origination.

‘ In 1817, pre-occupied by an intense desire to contribute something on my part to the triumph of constitutional opinions, I set about searching in books of history, for proofs and arguments in support of my political creed. Entering on the task with all the ardour of youth, I soon found myself taking pleasure in history on its own account, as a picture of the past, quite independently of any inductions I might derive from it in application to present times. Without ceasing to make facts available to my purpose, I observed them with curiosity, even when they contributed nothing in advancement of the cause to which I had devoted myself; and whenever an individual or an event of the middle age presented any striking qualities or local illustration, I felt an involuntary emotion. This feeling frequently recurring, soon made a complete change in my literary habits. Insensibly I gave up modern, and attached myself to ancient books; histories I exchanged for chronicles, and perceived how unfavourable to the fair exhibition of truth were the conventional arrangements and laboured style of our popular historians. I endeavoured to efface from my mind all that they had taught me, and I rose, thus to speak, in rebellion against my masters. The greater the fame and credit of an author, the more indignant I felt at having given him implicit credence, and at the knowledge that many others believed and were deceived like me.’

These ‘ Letters ’ are, in truth, a series of dissertations, intermingled with narrative, and illustrated by interesting citations from original authorities. Although strictly inductive in his system of investigation, M. Thierry has evidently kept certain favourite points in view, and these are almost invariably connected with what would be deemed, in some quarters, democratical opinions. He details with considerable minuteness the efforts made by the cities and burghs of France, more than seven centuries ago, to achieve or to maintain their municipal liberties; and he rejects, with successful energy, the received notion, that the *Communes* were indebted for their franchises to Louis-le-Gros. He makes it plain, that the original structure, if we may use the phrase, of the Gallic nation, was founded on free institutions; and that, however these might be impaired by the irruptions of the Franks, the usurpations of the priesthood, the encroachments of petty potentates, or the more direct in-

fringements of kingly despotism, there was from the beginning, and there has survived through every change, a strong attachment to freedom among the denizens of France; and that the various out-breakings which, under different names, have from time to time, down to the recent revolution, convulsed that fine country, and shaken the throne and the hierarchy to their foundations, are to be taken but as the expression of an indelible sentiment, that must ultimately triumph over all opposition, whether of force or of intrigue.

It has, unquestionably, been fatal to sound views of history, that there has prevailed a disposition to refer all contemporary events and circumstances to certain individuals as their centres and prime movers, without sufficiently considering, that those conspicuous persons might be the representatives of the spirit of the times, borne up by its elasticity, and put forward by its energy, rather than the masters and directors of their age. A thorough and impartial examination would, in nine instances out of ten, exhibit the apparently controlling and commanding agent, as little more than the mere subject of re-agencies; not stemming the stream, but drifting with the current, or whirling in the eddy. Warriors are, unhappily, more rife than legislators. For one Alfred we have twenty Clovises; and the latter are apt to make more bustle in the world, than the former. And the men who urge mankind forward in the advance of morals and intellect, are not only more rare, but less worthily treated, than those who are merely carried onward by the common course of things. The world is proud of its own creations, gets fond of its delegates, and acquiesces in any thing that may have a tendency to magnify and perpetuate the delusion. Hence we find the propensity to identify leading circumstances with conspicuous names, not only aiding to give erroneous views of particular facts, but influencing the whole course of history, and affecting its main positions. Thus Clovis, or, as M. Thierry calls him, Hlodewig, the Sicambrian chief, has been transformed, from the conqueror of the northern provinces of Gaul, and the devastator of the south, into the majestic founder of the French monarchy; and the most desperate efforts have been made to preserve the traces of family succession. Long after the term of his partial conquest, France was a divided country, not on the mere principle of fiefs and petty sovereignties, but specifically and absolutely. M. Thierry sternly and eloquently rebukes the servility and indolent acquiescence of the historians who have lent themselves to this system of deception; and, although the extract will be of some length, we shall translate the important passage in which he exposes the misrepresentations of the writers who have made of the annals of France,

the adulatory chronicle of the monarchy, rather than the history of the people.

‘ It is not sufficient to the writer of history, that he be susceptible of the vulgar admiration of what is usually called a hero ; he should possess a more educated and comprehensive kind of feeling and judgment ; the love of men as men, independently of their renown or their social state ; sensibility strong enough to give him an interest in the destinies of a whole nation, exciting him to follow it through the course of ages, as we follow the progress of a friend through a perilous career.

‘ This sentiment, which is the very soul of history, has been wanting to the writers who, up to the present day, have attempted ours. Not finding in themselves the principle by which alone they might be enabled to rally round a single interest the innumerable parts of the picture which they had undertaken to exhibit, they looked abroad for the connecting postulate, and found it in the apparent continuity of certain political existences, in the chimera of an uninterrupted transmission of a power always the same, to the descendants of the same family. To shore up this scaffolding, and to preserve the connexion of their narratives, they have been compelled to falsify facts in a thousand different ways. They have omitted authentic reigns, forged imaginary relationships, and kept in abeyance the acts and forms of the ancient election of kings ; they have affected to find the legacy of all France, both persons and possessions, established as a right, in testamentary documents which transmitted nothing but estates and chattels, entirely and simply personal ; they have travestied the popular assemblies of the conquerors of Gaul, into high courts of Aulic justice. When they found the individuals of that nation assembling in arms, on hills or in extensive plains, to pass their laws by vote, they represented them as the servile auditors of some imperial rescript ; as subjects in the presence of a master who speaks and none dare gainsay. Every fact is thus distorted by arbitrary interpretation ; and, thanks to this ingenious system, after having read our history, it is difficult to retain the distinct conception of anything, in point of manners and institutions, beyond the finished details of a royal household.

‘ From these recitals, which take in so many years, and in which the French nation makes so insignificant a figure, it is impossible to pass on, without a feeling of dizziness, to the history of the thirty years which have just gone by. We seem all at once transported to another country, a new people ; and yet, they are the same men. In like manner as we connect ourselves with the Frenchmen who lived before the eighteenth century, in name and in descent, we should feel the same connection in our ideas, our hopes, and our desires, if their thoughts and their actions were fairly represented.

‘ We have been, long ago, preceded in the quest of public liberty, by those serfs, liberated from the soil, who raised, six hundred years since, the walls and the civilization of the ancient Gaulish cities. Let us be persuaded that they were of some importance, and that the most numerous and neglected part of the nation deserves to be noticed in



history. If the nobility can refer to the past for their high deeds of arms and their military fame, there remains for the common people the renown of industry and talent. It was the plebeian who trained the war-horse of the noble, and adjusted the plates of his armour. Those who enlivened the festivals of the chieftain's mansion with poetry and music, were of the common class. The language, in fact, which we now speak, was that of the people; they gave it substance and form, in an age when courts and castles echoed the rude and guttural sounds of a High-Dutch dialect.'

It is both amusing and important, to trace the successive changes of fashion in literature; and especially in historical composition. Our ancestors of antique times filled their pages with feats of arms, romantic adventures, hair-breadth escapes, love and gallantry. Their titles were as quaint as their style; and their qualities as whimsical as their critical canons. They gave out, for the special gratification and advantage of court-idlers and maids of honour, 'Mirrors' and 'Gardens of History'; they mixed up simplicity and extravagance, piety and libertinism, in a most absurd but piquant olio; and they employed much and special eloquence on dresses and decorations, pageants and punctilios. Then came the men of classical imitation, pompous and precise, all strut and stiffness, dealing much and mortally in parallels and harangues. Last came the philosophical historians; the gentry who never allow their reader to think for himself, but are continually supplying him with ready-made reflection and opinion, in the shape of intermingled sentiment, disquisitory annotations, appendices, digressions, dissertations. In all these departments, there have been men of distinguished talent, and each has been popular in its day; but a different fashion seems now likely to prevail, and some hundred years hence, this may be superseded by another. We are not quite sure that we thoroughly understand M. Thierry's canons of historical criticism, valuable as they are, and fraught with important intimations. If we enter rightly into his notions, he would invariably make of history a regular pleading for the people, a purely democratic assertion of popular rights, making no account of kings, nobles, and priests, but as the creatures and functionaries of the commonwealth. However we may be disposed to agree with him in theory, we exceedingly question if it be possible to write the history of nations, as nations have hitherto existed, in this spirit of unmingled republicanism. We must have other times and tempers, the historian must fall on different days, before all this can be realized. Our descendants, if the grand system of experiment now going on in the western world should be successful, may be able to represent things in a different light; but hitherto, there has been such a collision and conflicting of interests, so much of assumption and so much of

habitual concession, such a preference of that which is conventional to that which is of reason and right,—that the ablest and most impartial men are as yet unable to disengage themselves from the prejudices and timidities of their educational and habitual associations. In the effort to accomplish this disenthralment, they are apt either to fall short or to go beyond; and we are inclined to suspect that M. Thierry may have done the latter. In the mean time, we are quite satisfied with the turn things are taking; and are disposed to think that the Sismondis and the Hallams are approaching as near to excellence as circumstances will admit.

We cannot venture on the discussion of the various and complicated matter contained in the earlier half of the 'Letters' before us, although of great interest and importance so far as the history of France is concerned: we must employ the remaining pages of this article in a somewhat general reference to that portion of the volume which is devoted to the illustration of the position; that the franchises of the French *communes* were the result, not of the monarch's concessions, but of their own spirited and persevering struggles. We have brief but pithy histories of the municipalities of Cambrai, Noyon, Beauvais, St. Quentin, Laon, Reims, and Vezelay; and from these, we shall select for exhibition and illustration, the Chronicle of Laon.

It is difficult to trace, with historical precision, the origin of that grand struggle which, at an early period of French history, was maintained by the people against their kings and the hierarchy, in assertion of their municipal independence. M. Thierry seems disposed to refer it to a twofold cause; an obscure feeling, unextinguished by five centuries of submission to barbarian conquest, of their Roman descent and privileges; and a tendency to insurrection, resulting from the comparison of their own superiority, in point of civilization, to their oppressors. Not that these worthy burghers had any very profound knowledge of Rome or Greece, or any distinct theory on the subject of civil government; but there might exist a kind of traditionary tendency to republican institutions, from the impulse of which they unconsciously acted. We shall not, however, discuss this point at present: when we shall have more specifically exhibited M. Thierry's mode of illustrating his hypothesis, we shall have an opportunity of briefly pointing out what appears to us as the error of his theory.

All modern revolutions originate in disputes between the people and the royal power: that of the *communes*, in the twelfth century, was necessarily of a different character. There were then few cities that held immediately of the king; the greater part of the burghs were the property of the barons or the abbatial churches, and the me-

tropolitan cities were, either wholly or in part, under the seignory of their bishops. Sometimes a lay-lord, master of the ancient citadel and the adjoining quarter, wrangled with the bishop for the suzerainty and government of the rest of the city ; sometimes the king possessed a tower where his provost held military possession, and levied from the citizens occasional subsidies, over and above the assessments which the bishop and the lord, each in his own district, exacted. Happily for the burghers, these three powers were not on very friendly terms. The insurrection of one of the quarters of the city, almost always found an auxiliary in the *seigneur* of the neighbouring ward ; and if the entire population combined, it rarely happened but that a seasonable present to one or other of the lieges, would procure their approbation of the revolt. Thus, the municipality of Auxerre was established by the consent of the count, in spite of the bishop ; and at Amiens, the king and the bishop sided with the citizens against the count. In what is now called the South of France, but which was then out of the limits of the kingdom, the bishops were, in general, friendly to civic freedom, and protectors of the *communes*. But in France properly so called, in Burgundy, and in Flanders, sometimes supported by the kings, and sometimes singly, the ecclesiastical sovereigns, with the aid of arms and anathemas, maintained against the *communes*, a war which, after the vicissitudes of three centuries, terminated in the simultaneous ruin of municipal rights and seignoral privileges.'

At the close of the eleventh century, Laon was one of the most important cities in the kingdom of France. The industry of the inhabitants and its advantageous situation, made it a sort of inferior capital, and the bishopric, with its right of seignorage, was one of the richest ecclesiastical benefices in the country. It became, in consequence, an object of intrigue and bribery : ambitious and rapacious men obtained it in succession, and the city was exposed to the usual effects of despotism and misrule. The nobles and their followers plundered the citizens by force of arms : the latter, in their turns, pillaged the peasantry who frequented the place for curiosity or traffic : and to these private excesses were added, the arbitrary levies of the episcopal sovereign, and the judiciary visitation of those who were unable to pay. In the year 1106, the see, after a vacancy of two years, was purchased by Gaudri, a Norman ecclesiastic, fierce, haughty, dissipated, and grasping. His cruelty was not inferior to his other bad qualities, and his savage mandates found a ready executioner in a black slave, whom he employed rather actively in torturing, putting out eyes, and inflicting death. At length, during the absence of this right reverend dignitary, the people persuaded, by the seasonable application of a handsome bribe, the clergy and knights whom he had left in authority, to grant them a municipal charter, providing for the security of person and property, the due administration of justice, and the equitable adjustment of taxation. Gaudri, on his return, was



induced, also by a well-timed *douceur*, to confirm by oath, the covenants that had been made in his absence; while the offer of an annual tribute procured the royal sanction. When, however, the money thus obtained had been spent, the bishop, with his clergy and nobles, began to plot against the liberties of the people; and, prevailing on the king to withdraw his consent, began anew the system of vexation. But three years of freedom had fostered a spirit that was not disposed to yield without a struggle. When it was ascertained that the charter had been annulled, the shops were shut as in a season of public mourning, secret assemblies were held, and a number of individuals bound themselves, by an oath, to exterminate the bishop and the nobles. The Archdeacon Anselm, an ecclesiastic in high repute for learning and probity, was apprised of the conspiracy, and, without betraying the plotters, warned the bishop of his danger, entreating him not to expose himself by taking part in a splendid procession then about to take place. 'Fie,' was the bishop's answer, 'I shall not die by such hands as those.' The advice was taken only in part: he armed his domestics, with a number of knights, and appeared at his post. While the procession was moving along, one of the conspirators started from a recess, exclaiming—*Commune! Commune!* But, owing to the want of concert, the demonstration ended in a slight tumult, and only served the purpose of putting the prelate on his guard, and inducing him to call in a number of peasantry from the demesnes of the church, as a garrison to his palace and the towers of the cathedral. These, however, he disorganized the following day; and when, after repeated delays, the citizens rose in good earnest, such was his infatuation, that he replied, with a hearty laugh, to the persons who brought the intelligence: 'What do these foolish people mean by their risings? If John, my black, were to pull the best man among them by the nose, he would not dare to grumble. Since I have compelled them to give up what they called their *commune*, I shall find no difficulty in keeping them quiet.'

'On the following day, in the afternoon, while the bishop, in full security, was arranging with an archdeacon named Walter, the new measures of police which had become necessary, and especially, the proportion and distribution of the assessments to be levied on the burgesses, a great disturbance took place in the streets, and a numerous crowd was heard to raise the cry of *Commune! Commune!* This was the signal of insurrection, and at the same moment, strong bodies of the citizens, armed with swords, lances, cross-bows, clubs, and axes, invested the episcopal palace, near the metropolitan church, of which they took possession. At the first announcement of this revolt, the nobles, who had promised the bishop to render him assistance in case of need, flocked hastily to him from all quarters; but, as fast as they

arrived, they were seized by the people, and massacred without mercy. As their principal object was to make sure of the bishop, they began the siege of the palace; and, having stormed it in spite of the resistance of those within, the bishop had only time to put on the dress of one of his domestics, and to take refuge in a cellar, where one of his people hid him in a barrel, which he closed up. The insurgents filled the house, examining in all directions, and crying out:—"Where is he, the traitor, the scoundrel?" A servant betrayed the hiding-place of his master. One of the chiefs of the revolt, and among the first who reached the spot pointed out, was a certain Thiégaud, a serf of the church of St. Vincent, who had for a considerable time received the tolls of a bridge near the city, belonging to Enguerrand, Lord of Coucy. In this office he had been a mighty plunderer, forcing money from the passengers, and, as was reported, sometimes putting them to death. This man, of brutal manners, was known to the bishop, who had bestowed on him in joke, the name of *Isengrin*,—a nick-name given to the wolf in the tales and fables of this time, just as Reynard is applied to the fox in the popular language of the present day. When the covering of the hogshead in which the bishop was crouching, had been raised by his pursuers,—“Is any one within?” cried Thiégaud, striking a stick against the side. “Here is a wretched prisoner,” replied the bishop, with a trembling voice. “Ah, ah!” said the serf of St. Vincent, “it is you then, master *Isengrin*, that have crept into this tub.” At the same time, he pulled out the bishop by the hair. He was severely beaten, and dragged into the street. All this while, he was supplicating for his life, offering to swear upon the gospels that he would resign the see, promising all the money he possessed, and protesting that, if they wished it, he would leave the country. But neither plaint nor prayer availed: their only answers were blows and insults. At last, a man named Bernard Desbruyeres gave him a blow on the head with a two-edged axe, and almost at the same moment, a second blow with the same weapon, finished his sufferings. Thiégaud, seeing on his finger the episcopal ring, cut it off with a sword to secure the prize: the body, entirely stripped, was thrust aside into a corner, and every burgess who passed by, flung dirt or stones, accompanying the insult with railing and curses.

In the mean time, murder and havock were following in the train of insurrection. The revolvers put to death all the nobles who had not fled, insulted and despoiled their dames, sacked their palaces, and set fire to the dwellings of the most obnoxious. They suffered, however, Archdeacon Anselm to bury the corpse of the bishop, although it was hurried into the grave without the rites of sepulture.

Thus far we have traced, in the history of the municipality of Laon, the average course of revolution. First, pacific attempts to obtain relief and privilege on the part of the people, with fair and specious concession from their superiors: then follows regret for power resigned, violation of promises, and re-assumption of authority: and last comes the terrible re-action, the wrath and vengeance

of the exasperated people. Happy will it be, both for rulers and for subjects, if the lessons supplied by past miseries, influence both parties to a wiser conduct, to conciliation and cordial union.

Matters, of course, did not rest in this state. The burghers, aware that they had gone too far either to recede or to hope for impunity, and with a view to secure an efficient auxiliary, purchased the alliance of a powerful baron, Thomas de Marle, the personal enemy of the then King of France, Louis-le-Gros. Their measures seem, however, to have been very absurdly arranged, since, instead of defending to the last, the walls, and trenches, and strong positions of their city, they abandoned it at the suggestion of their ally, and took refuge in his fortresses. Laon was immediately plundered, the worthy Thomas de Marle himself following the example. The partisans of the bishop broke loose, and those of the inhabitants who remained behind, guilty or innocent, were hunted out without mercy, and tortured or slain. War raged fiercely in the neighbouring regions. Thomas de Marle spared neither convents nor holy places; nor was the struggle stayed, until the king in person had compelled, after a long siege, the strong castle of that fierce noble to surrender. The citizens of Laon who were found in it, suffered the pains and penalties of high treason; and the ecclesiastical power was re-established, without stipulation, in the devoted city. Still, the spirit of freedom survived the desolation. Another series of efforts, of which the particulars are not preserved, terminated, in 1128, in the concession of a charter, granted by the bishop, and ratified by the same Louis-le-Gros who had destroyed the former. A full amnesty was published, and, with the exception of thirteen individuals, whose names are recorded in the instrument, all exiles were permitted to return. During the forty or fifty years which followed this happy compact, the citizens of Laon prospered and grew wealthy; but their tranquillity was interrupted by the intrigues and violence of Roger de Rosay, who was made bishop in 1175. A war ensued, in which the King of France, Louis-le-Jeune, took part with the municipality, and the bishop was compelled to withdraw his pretensions. In the succeeding reign, he was more successful; and for a short time, the charter was annulled, though it was speedily renewed. Without, however, following any further, the variations of craft and force which were alternately employed, we shall state briefly, that, in 1331, the commercial privileges of Laon were finally taken away; and a special ordinance provided, that their great bells should be confiscated, and the bell-tower no longer be called by the name of belfry.

As social revolutions never take place without an alteration of the names attached to public edifices, a subsequent order forbade that the tower from which the two great bells of the municipality had been



taken away, should any longer be called belfry (*beffroi*). It should seem, that by this it was intended to efface the democratic recollections attached to those ancient walls, whence was heard of old the signal which announced to the free burgesses the opening of the popular assembly, or the danger of the city. The belfry, or the great communal tower, built in the centre of the city, was a subject of pride and emulation among the small republics of the middle ages. They employed large sums in building and ornamenting them, that they might give from their height and station, a lofty idea of the power of their possessors. It was chiefly among the *communes* of the south, that this species of emulation reigned; they strove to surpass each other in magnificence, and sometimes in whimsical effect, in the construction of their towers. They gave to these edifices sonorous and far-fetched names, such as *Mirandin*, or the *Marvel*; and it is probable, that the famous tower of Pisa owes to a vanity of this kind its singular architecture.'

Such is the view taken by M. Thierry of a state of society which has excited too little attention on the part of historians, and which deserves more minute and extensive investigation. In one respect, we are inclined to think that he has been in some degree misled by his theory, and by his zeal in behalf of free institutions. In all this restlessness of the municipalities of France, he discovers the evidence of a spirit of liberty, and of a tendency to its assertion, pervading the whole course of French history; the illustration of a continued, though not always obvious controversy between governors and people concerning popular rights. With him, it is a fragment of constitutional history, and finding its parallel in recent events. To us, however, it appears, that it may be accounted for on much more simple and tangible principles. Man's first impulses will, of course, lead him to seek the supply of his animal necessities; and while he can secure this, and nothing more, he will probably remain in a contented though humble condition. But let him once wax fat, and he will kick. When society passes from the state of poverty to that of wealth, it will carry its desires forward to the possession of power; and if that desideratum be in the exclusive grasp of any individual or corporation whatsoever, there will be jealousies, and enmities, and strife. Now this was precisely the state of things in the case before us. The cities were populous, and the people rich; they felt their consequence; they were desirous of power, both as power simply, and as the security of their wealth and independence relatively. Hence, their persevering hostility to their oppressors.

There is another view of the matter, on which we lay no stress, because we are not prepared to follow it out; but which, if we were in want of a subject for investigation, we should feel inclined to pursue with some attention. Might not all this agitation have somewhat of a religious character; and, without combining distinct views of the proper substitute, have for its

object, the rejection of that heavy and unrelenting oppression, which not only bound the body and enthralled the intellect, but weighed down the souls and consciences of men?

---

Art. V. *On the Principles of Interpretation, as applied to the Prophecies of Holy Scripture*: a Discourse, delivered before the Monthly Association of Congregational Ministers; and published at their Request. With Enlargements and Supplementary Notes. By John Pye Smith, D.D. 8vo. pp. 72. Price 2s. 6d. London. 1829.

**T**HERE is, surely, no more certain indication of a vitiated religious taste, than a disrelish for the plainer and more practical parts of the inspired volume,—those in which, in these last days, God hath spoken unto us by his Son; and a preference for those portions which, from their poetical phraseology and recondite allusions, are necessarily involved in great obscurity. Yet, among a certain class, not a small one, of religious persons, the letter of Scripture is deemed worthy of so much more attention and reverence than its true meaning, that those texts and phrases are the most frequently cited, the import of which is least obvious and direct; and cited, in many cases, in a mystical sense, wholly foreign from the true grammatical import. We have had opportunities of observing, how fond more especially illiterate teachers and ministers of limited attainments are, of selecting their texts from the prophetic parts of the Old Testament; seizing upon some highly figurative expression, either as a motto, or a spiritual enigma, in utter disregard of the context and the general subject. For such persons, the historical portions of Scripture have little attraction, unless as they can be construed typically; the devotional portions are not more to their taste, unless they can be interpreted mystically; and even the prophetic Scriptures are little esteemed, except as accommodated to a spiritual sense. In fact, by a general rule of inversion, the devotional parts of Scripture are by them regarded as prophetic, the prophetic as devotional. They find the Gospel chiefly in the Old Testament, and esteem the Apocalypse the most precious portion of the New.

This strange propensity may in part, perhaps, be traced to that law of our nature, by which what is indefinite and obscure, acts with greater force upon the imagination, and produces the strongest emotions. There is a mysterious charm investing dark passages, and secret chambers, and the dim religious light of Romish temples, that attaches to no other species of architecture; and it would seem that, in some way analogous to this, obscure ideas,—the rays of truth dimmed and coloured by an imperfect medium,—produce an effect on certain minds, which

clear ideas would not have. An enigma, a paradox, a parable, will rouse and stimulate the languid or undeveloped reasoning powers of the child or the savage, when the bare truth would fail to interest. And thus, a figurative phrase, to which an obscure and indistinct meaning is attached, will impress the mind more forcibly than the same truth literally and simply expressed. The same cause gives to hieroglyphic characters a power over the imagination, which cannot be excited by alphabetic writing. And so it is, that the hieroglyphic language of prophecy derives a charm from its very obscurity and indistinctness; and nothing is to some persons more unwelcome, than the services of the critic and the expositor.

That 'grammarians would take upon themselves to teach 'bishops and divines',—that pedants would come to be preferred to canonists, and Greek scholars to schoolmen, was the reasonable apprehension entertained by the fathers of Trent, as the consequence of the study and translation of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. The same prejudice which led them to contend for the Divine and paramount authority of the Latin version, still operates on the minds of many Protestants with respect to the authorized English Translation. To the correct interpretation of Scripture, there is as strong repugnance in the minds of many well-meaning persons among ourselves, as was then avowed by the Romanists against the translation of Scripture. But what is the design of a translation? Is it any other than to place an unlearned reader as nearly as possible in the situation of the parties to whom the sacred document was originally addressed, so as to enable him to exercise his own faculties immediately upon the plain substance of the Divine communication or record? But a translation, however faithful and adequate, can but very imperfectly effect this. Unacquainted with the historic facts, the customs and usages, and conventional idiom of those remote times and foreign countries, the modern reader is placed under circumstances extremely disadvantageous. He will still have, in many cases, the interpretation,—the *true* translation, to seek. If it be really his wish to arrive at the genuine sense, he will not content himself with having the words in his own language, but will anxiously seek to ascertain the spirit of the original. And in order to this, the only rational method is to cultivate that historical and philological knowledge, the amplest possession of which, though it may entitle the individual to the distinction of a learned man, does but place him on a level, as to the means of understanding the Scriptures, with the plainest and most unlettered believer of the age and nation to which the inspired writer originally addressed himself.

This, however, is *not* the method which is the most usually



adopted. Biblical students have ever been more apt to seek for mysteries in the sacred text, for treasures of philosophy in the depths of etymology, and spiritual conundrums in the figures and metaphors of poetry, than to close with the real difficulties of interpretation, which are for the most part extrinsic to the text itself. Where is the passage so obscure that we should be at any loss as to the intention of the sacred writer, if we could but know the circumstances under which he was placed, and the facts that were present to his mind? We speak now of the interpretation of language, whether in its simpler conventional form, or in that of a figurative and poetic diction. The interpretation of prophecy has its peculiar difficulties, arising partly from the deficiency of our historic knowledge, and partly from other causes, which are pointed out in the highly valuable production which has suggested these remarks.

The main design of the learned Author, as intimated in the title-page, is not to propose any new scheme of interpretation; nor to stimulate Christians indiscriminately to pursue the investigation of the prophecies, but to recal the Church to sound principles of interpretation, which have been too much lost sight of. He places the importance of this branch of sacred knowledge in its just light, when he remarks, that it serves to the illustration of God's universal providence; it confirms, by the most decisive proof, the reality of revealed religion; it is a part of the homage due to the records of that revelation; it elicits and establishes many of the most important rules for the interpretation of the Bible generally; and it furnishes a rich abundance of the materials and motives for devotion.

‘For those persons, therefore,’ adds Dr. S., ‘who possess the requisite means and opportunities for this purpose, it is clearly a duty, to employ a sufficient portion of their time and talents in the diligent search into the meaning and the fulfilment of the prophetic oracles. Yet, we cannot hold forth this as an easy occupation. We cannot promise success in it to indolent or partial inquirers, to those who have a previously-formed system for which they are only in quest of support, to those who are seeking the gratification of an indeavour curiosity, or (though I cannot express this without reluctance) to any persons, however sincere and upright, who implicitly rely upon the common translation in these, which, more than the other books of scripture, are generally remarkable for difficulty in the terms and obscurity in the matter. This difficulty and obscurity are intimated in various parts of the divine word. Striking instances we have in those passages of the last prophetic book of scripture, which expressly demand a mind endowed with a peculiar “wisdom,” in order to understand its mysterious language.’ pp. 1, 2.

Towards the close of the discourse, the following most seasonable counsel, dictated alike by wisdom and kindness, is ad-

dressed to those who are in danger of being led away by the prevailing excitement.

‘ I must express the conviction of my mind, that it is not the immediate duty of all Christians to engage in this branch of scriptural inquiry : and this conviction rests upon the plain reason, that God has not made that the duty of any persons, for which he has not furnished them with the necessary means. But the larger part of sincere and devout believers cannot command the time which those long and laborious disquisitions require, in order to pursue them advantageously ; and, if they had sufficient leisure without neglecting plainly incumbent duties, they are not possessed of that acquaintance with philology and history, which is manifestly indispensable to investigations of this nature. Let not such excellent persons regret their disability. They have other and more profitable objects to engage their attention and to fill their hearts. They need not occupy themselves with “ the light shining in a dark place,” when they can walk under the brightness of the Sun of Righteousness ; the clearly revealed doctrines and promises, the precepts, examples, warnings, devotional compositions, and historical illustrations of the divine word. Yet, I am far from supposing that it is not incumbent upon those to whom Providence has given the means and opportunities, to engage in this class of sacred studies ; provided they do not allow it to infringe upon the more obvious and universally necessary duties of faith and obedience. But it should not be forgotten, that these pursuits are not a little ensnaring ; and that, without sanctified wisdom and watchfulness, they are very liable to usurp an immoderate measure of attention and feeling. Such ill-proportioned “ knowledge puffeth up.” If we embark in these inquiries, from a curious desire of prying into futurity, from an “ ambition to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power,” or from a wish to distinguish ourselves among our fellow-christians, we may be assured that we are in a sinful state of mind, and that the divine blessing will not descend upon our occupation. If even we had the very gift itself “ of prophecy, and understood all mysteries and all knowledge,—and had not charity, we should be nothing ” that is good and valuable in the divine estimation. “ Covet earnestly,” says the apostle, “ the best gifts : and yet I shew unto you a more excellent way.” Let us, then, seek to combine all other studies with a holy, humble, and devout state of mind and action. Let us “ grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Let us strive to become more deeply acquainted with the doctrines, the practical applications, and the *fulfilled* prophecies of the divine word, respecting his Person, his work, and his free salvation. Let us seek to have our hearts more enlarged and filled with the purest principles of faith and piety and active usefulness. These will be incomparably greater and more glorious attainments than the most profound study of unfulfilled prophecy, or the most correct acquaintance with the principles upon which it must be interpreted.’ pp. 55, 56.

To the Biblical student, the Rules for the Interpretation of Prophecy, laid down by Dr. Smith, will afford a safe and useful directory. They differ from those which were given from Dr.

Allix in a former Number, in partaking less of the character of canons or axiomatic propositions, being rather practical directions of a general nature. They are preceded by a brief but extremely valuable historical sketch of the Hebrew inspired prophets, in the order of time in which they flourished. The Rules themselves, which are twelve in number, we deem it unnecessary to transcribe; nor shall we attempt an analysis of a discourse which is itself so truly analytical in its spirit, and which, we doubt not, will soon be in the possession of every intelligent reader who feels an interest in the subject. Under the sixth Rule, the learned Writer adverts to the pernicious mistakes into which some professed interpreters have fallen, through a want of historical knowledge, and the practice of arbitrarily misapplying fulfilled prophecies to the history of the Christian Church, the experience of individual believers, or the present state and future destiny of modern nations. 'But it may be asked', he proceeds to say, 'are we not at liberty to take striking passages of Scripture, and apply them to new and important purposes upon a principle of accommodation?'

'Permit me to answer this question by asking another: Are we at liberty to put any meaning upon the word of God, different from *its own* proper, designed, and genuine sense, as ascertained by competent investigation?—I can imagine only one way in which such accommodations can be permitted by a conscientious mind; and that is, the existence of some resemblance or analogy, either in the phraseology or in the sentiment, between the cases proposed. If the analogy be in the former, the citation is merely in the same way in which men often quote a line of poetry, and apply it to any new occasion: yet it should be recollected that, in so applying a fine passage, of Virgil or Milton for instance, we can do no harm; we can lead no man into error by it; the new application is never supposed to have been the original intention of the author. But, since the Scriptures are the repository of God's revelation, to which all Christians justly look for the authoritative declarations of eternal truth and religious obligation, it is evidently a far more serious matter for us to quote scriptural passages, even in an incidental way. It is almost certain, that most hearers and readers will imagine that the transient citation, or the felicitous allusion, is mentioned *as evidence* in the particular respect for which it is adduced. To say the least, therefore, we ought not to indulge in this practice without taking especial care to guard against being misapprehended.

'In the other case supposed, that of an analogy of sentiment, I humbly conceive that there is a perfectly safe and legitimate way in which we may proceed. Perhaps there are not in Scripture any recitals of fact, or traits of character, or precepts or other declarations given under specific circumstances, which, on due consideration, are not most truly to be regarded as *Cases of some GENERAL Principle*; particular instances under some one great class of doctrinal truth, or moral reasoning, or the conduct of the divine dispensations. We can,



therefore, from the particular instance, ascend to the general principle; and, that principle being established by its own evidence, we can bring it down to any new case which appears to fall within its range.

For example: we may take Isaiah xxxiii. 14, "The sinners in Zion are afraid, fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites: Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" The connexion refers to the deliverance of the pious Hezekiah and his people, who trusted in God, from their Assyrian invaders and from the machinations of the traitorous and heathenishly-inclined party at home. Against them the judgements of heaven are denounced, in verses 11 and 12, under the frequent figure of "devouring fire:" and in this passage the detected faction, upon the defeat of their projects and the discovery of their treasons, are described as stricken with terror and despair. Here, then, is a single instance under a general class; and it illustrates a *Principle*, namely, the certainty of Divine Justice in the punishment of the impenitent and hypocritical according to their deserts. This *universal Principle*, therefore, can be educed, confirmed, and enforced, as equally true and equally claiming the regard of mankind, at all times and under all varieties of circumstance. If those enemies to their country had so much reason to be afraid, what dread should possess rebels and traitors against the law and the gospel of God? The prophet immediately proceeds to declare the security of the righteous, in the midst of the judgements which fall upon the wicked: and thus he supplies us with an exemplification of another great principle in the moral government of God, which we can safely apply to the widest extent." pp. 36, 37.

By an attention to this principle of interpretation, which might seem obvious, were it not, in fact, so generally overlooked, the most extensive practical use of the prophetic writings, may be combined with the most rigid adherence to the genuine meaning which is 'the mind of the Spirit.' 'We can never be 'under a necessity', remarks Dr. S., 'and should never yield 'to the temptation, to give untrue interpretations of any part of 'God's most sacred word, in order to have materials for any 'kind of religious exhortation.'

It is remarkable, yet not surprising, that some of the individuals who have indulged themselves the most unreservedly in these untrue applications of the word of God, have been the sticklers for the dogma of a plenary verbal inspiration. The Rabbies counted the letters of the sacred text, and almost worshipped the books of that law, of which they unscrupulously perverted the import.

Dr. Smith objects to the term '*double sense*', in reference to the prophecies, as ill-chosen and liable to be misunderstood; and another expression current in some circles, 'a literal and a 'spiritual sense', he regards as still more improper and pernicious.

He contends, that what Bishop Lowth terms, 'the internal sense' of such passages as are capable of a literal meaning, is the only true, genuine, and intended sense of the inspired word.

'There are kinds of composition in which an apparent sense is presented, which every intelligent reader sees is only an envelope for another meaning; and it is *this other* meaning which is the author's *actual design*, his *one and true intention*. These are allegories and parodies, of which examples are to be found in the literature of all countries; and the oriental nations have been remarkably attached to such forms of composition. Now, proverbs, apologues, parables, and allegories, all falling under this class, do occur in the Scriptures: and not infrequently, large portions of the prophetic writings consist of such similitudes. In this way, also, use is made of the symbolical imagery treated of in a former part of this Discourse. But even here, I conceive that the phrase, *double sense*, is not a correct one; for the first or superficial signification is not what the author intends: his *true and genuine* meaning is but *one*.

'But there was a peculiarity in the inspired writings of the Hebrews, which could belong to no other writings; because it arose out of the religious and political constitution which the Author of truth and God of grace was pleased to confer upon them. That constitution was formed upon a principle of subserviency to the *spiritual reign* of which we have before spoken, the progressive kingdom of the Messiah. Under the Israelitish constitution, Moses, Aaron, David, and the offices themselves of prophet, priest, and king, were *types*, that is, *intended resemblances*, of circumstances corresponding in the person, the work, and the people of the Messiah. Hence, many descriptions occur in the prophetic parts of the Old Testament, which are applicable to the persons who are their immediate subjects, only in a partial and very imperfect manner; but which find a complete and satisfactory correspondence to their *FULL* meaning, in the Messiah and the new dispensation of which he is the Head. In the application of this principle, the ancient Israelitish Church is repeatedly asserted in the New Testament to be a designed representation of the Christian Church. "All these things happened unto them for [τύποι] ensamples. The first tabernacle was [παράβολη] a figure for the time then present.—The law had a shadow of the good things which were to come.—Ye are come unto the mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem."

'But I do not perceive that the application of this principle is the admission of a *double* sense. It is one sense; it is one predicate or collection of predicates; but, by original design and construction, formed so as to be applied to two subjects; to the first, by anticipation and partially, and to the second, in complete perfection; the former being the temporary representative and introduction to the latter.'

pp. 51, 52.

Having elsewhere used the term 'double sense', as a convenient, rather than a strictly proper mode of expression, we are desirous of intimating our concurrence in these judicious

and important observations. At the same time, it will be perceived, that Dr. Smith, while objecting to the term, admits the fact, that the language of the sacred writers, while susceptible of an apparent and literal sense, sometimes envelops an interior, prophetic sense. In this case, although the meaning is one, the sense, we submit, may be termed without great impropriety two-fold. But those critics who, with Michaelis, object, not to the term, but to 'the hypothesis of a double sense', deny that internal meaning which Dr. Smith contends for as the only one actually intended. In opposition to them, we would defend the use of the word till a better is suggested, not as altogether unexceptionable, but as related to that most important principle of interpretation, which the Author of this discourse has so ably advocated.

The Supplementary Notes appended to the Discourse, are replete with valuable critical matter; but we cannot more distinctly allude to their contents, having already exceeded our prescribed limits. This 'Discourse' is not, however, to be viewed as belonging to the ephemeral class of publications usually so designated: it is a learned academic prelection.

Art. VI. *On Tendency to Disease of Body and Mind in refined Life, and the general Principles of Cure.* By Leonard Stewart, M.D., Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians. 12mo. pp. 96. Price 4s. London, 1828.

**T**HE medical publications of the day, which proffer their claims to notice, are, it has been remarked, of three distinct classes. One consists of erudite and technical works, exclusively calling upon professional readers. A second class, the contrast of this, have for their avowed design, to make 'every man his own Physician'. A third comprises works that are so far professional as to be worthy the perusal of the profession, and so far popular as to be interesting to the man of general intelligence. Under this last division must the little tract before us be classed; for, while it contains several intimations which the most learned member of the faculty might find his account in perusing, it is mainly, as its title indeed indicates, intended for the instruction of the non-initiated in the principles of medical lore.

Dr. Stewart has endeavoured to prove, that medicine is most inadequately appreciated, when regarded as a matter of mere abstract science or confined observation. He wishes to put the public into a way of more correctly estimating the nature and design of the healing art, about which, general opinion is, he maintains, on many points extremely erroneous, notwithstanding



the many publications that have recently issued from the press, of a more liberal and general bearing than was wont formerly to characterize medical writings. It would appear, moreover, from the following paragraph, that Dr. Stewart, in common with many others of his profession, has been occasionally annoyed by finding the *post hoc* made the *propter hoc* inference; by hearing an unjust and unmeaning judgement passed on medical merit; and he is avowedly indignant against the charlatanism that ventures to make promises, and the credulity that listens to promises, which in their very nature are necessarily vain and futile.

'The man', says our Author, 'who quarrels with his physician because he cannot produce some drug, of a power so magical as to charm away all the grim ministers of death, and in a fit of despair supinely resigns his cure to time alone, is like one who expects to reap where he has not sown. But if he can be aroused to join his adviser in instituting a series of experiments, duly guarded by analogy, but not too much restricted by routine—repeated when success warrants their use, or totally varied if one fixed plan is found unavailing—minute where morbid action can be traced into a corner, or general when it depends upon predisposing or constitutional causes;—such a course of endeavour, candid, assiduous, and rational, deserves the name of cure, and will often meet with the success which it merits. Let both parties "put the shoulder to the wheel", and in good faith abide by the result;

"Nullum numen abest, si adsit prudentia."

From the last page of this little work, we turn back to the first, where it is stated to be the professed object of the Author, to direct attention 'to those indefinite states of being, both mental and corporal, in which positive disease cannot be recognised, but where, from over excitement or preternatural hebetude of the system, any perilous consequence may be anticipated, unless some powerful renovating agent be in time interposed.' 'The subject', Dr. S. says, 'should be doubly interesting; first, because few people are entirely exempt from the evils which it is intended to describe; and secondly, because the general modes of cure can, with some confidence, be pointed out.'

In the course of his remarks, Dr. S., with many others, insists upon the evil effects of indiscriminate repletion; but the especial design of the present publication leads him to push on his objections against *mental*, as well as bodily cramming. Dr. Stewart contends, and in our opinion justly, that the great secret of avoiding *nervousness*, is to encourage in ourselves, and to impress upon our progeny, the high value of independence upon external good. Happiness and health, he intimates, are too much sought for in the abundance of the things we possess;

and were we, in respect of passive indulgence, to recede somewhat from the march we have made into the alluring provinces of imagination and taste; were we to return, in some measure, to that state of rude simplicity from which our boast is that we have extricated ourselves; we should find that the nervous organization would be in a fair way of regaining that condition of tone and strength, of which a forgetfulness of the very tenure upon which enjoyment is held, has deprived us.

‘The opportunities and the conveniences,’ remarks the Writer, ‘which crowded cities offer to various pursuits and appetites, keep a motley swarm within the circle of its attraction. Here the man of letters and the sensualist, the drudge in the lengthening wilds of a profession, and the gambler, all find the factitious atmosphere where they have best their being, and devoting themselves each to the god of his idolatry, become victims to the great Saturn that devours all his children. The path each follows to exclusive good, is made to him the road to destruction. It is not by occasional excesses, but by continued enervating exhaustion of nervous power, that the equilibrium of the vital functions is overthrown. After years of unvaried application to the calls of engrossing care or voluptuous engagements, the whole fleshy fabric is relaxed; the muscles lose their defined shape and tone, the skin its natural suffusion and smoothness, the extremities burn or freeze, the head throbs, and the heart flags. Without declared warfare, all the elements of our system rebel, and threaten to set up apoplexy, insanity, or some other form of disease, if attention be not turned to their wholesome government. If, by any accidental circumstance, one of these followers of a fixed idea be thrown out of his habitual course of action, the elasticity of the complex organism is found to be impaired. The taste for strong excitement is not all at once exchanged for more gentle stimuli; and the overstrained faculties heave and swell, like the panting members of the newly reposed Hercules. We have only to look around us on ‘Change, or in the societies of the dissipated, to see the dull eye and flabby corpulency of lethargic apathy, or the pinched features of fidgetty irritability. The limbs are either shrunk and emaciated, or they are misshapen and bloated; and the healthy glow, and spring, and plumpness of the breathing mass, are insensibly, but gradually undermined and extinguished.’

These principles and precepts in reference to the mode in which inroads upon our physical and moral well-being are constantly made, have been often announced by others; indeed, they are sufficiently obvious to a reflecting and observant man; but we do not recollect to have met with any treatise which, in so short a compass, and in a manner so lively and original, enforces the great doctrine of independence as a requisite to well-being. In his style, Dr. S. often reminds us of the late Dr. Beddoes. It is, indeed, the *medico-morality* of the tract before us, which constitutes its peculiar claim to our notice. To speak of moral change as entirely dependent upon a physical

alteration in our bodily frames, is to use a language which implies the denial of human responsibility, and which conveys the notion, that man is at the complete mercy of the particles of matter which compose his corporeal fabric. But to trace the moral workings of physical error; to shew that bodily strength, when deteriorated, leads on to mental suffering, and that we become uncomfortable by the very processes we are instituting to add to the sum of our comforts; is to be engaged in a manly and worthy occupation of time and talents. And when talents such as Dr. Stewart has proved himself to possess, are brought to bear upon the inculcation of these obvious, yet neglected truths, we feel a conviction that more extensive good may often be effected, and of a far more radical nature, than by the mere enunciation of abstract *dicta* as to the right and the wrong. The very selfishness of man may be turned to a good account, by forcible representations of the *immediate* and *physical* evils likely to be entailed by a line of conduct, which shall be far from implying a gross violation of strict morality, and yet, not such as to obtain the benefits,—even the direct and sensual benefits, which it is supposed to supply. It is on this ground that we are disposed to recommend the perusal of Dr. Stewart's publication; which, if it answer no better purpose, will at least furnish an hour's entertainment to the reader of taste and refinement. It may serve, however, we think, to put some individuals upon the serious business of altering the course of life they may hitherto have pursued, with quite as much effect as a sententious moral essay from the Rambler, on the one hand, or a treatise on diet and regimen, indigestion and liver complaints, on the other. We shall make room for one more extract, which we give without comment.

‘ How often has the *beau ideal* of an exclusive sublimed existence, turned out to be but a sorry substitute for the variegated but relishing mixture which is provided for every one's repast! How often, alas! does the conviction of the necessity for actively pursuing the real objects of life, come later than the fit season for exertion and enjoyment!

‘ From a state of listlessness and irresolution, the most dreaded evils may spring. Up rises the imagination, a hideous, unformed spectre, and haunts the untenanted mind. Refuge from the fiend is sought in strong excitement, which is succeeded by moping, nervous melancholy. Indigestion, with its train of woes, follows from too great attention to the only regular business of the day—*eating and drinking*. If some hasty malady do not prevent, suicide is often called in as a relief from ennui. Or, where the sufferer is doomed to linger on his long disease, he can know neither pleasure nor repose. The deep shade and contrast which labour gives to the picture is not present, and there remains but an unmeaning blank. Sleep flies his pillow, and enjoyment



from the most alluring pastimes. A mere passenger in the ship of life, his sick existence is passed in disgust and nothingness.

'Ladies, both by constitution and education, are particularly liable to suffer from the passive state induced by over-refinement. So much is present to captivate their native delicacy and timidity, that they do not perceive the dangers of having these morbidly increased. Ever busied with unnumbered details, they have frequently no one engrossing occupation. Leaning for support on some loved relative, and deluded by the thought, that they may so continue secure and blameless, they prepare neither for the disappointments nor the duties of real life. The willing adoration of the protecting sex raises them above the thoughts and cares of the busy world. They are never told of the uncertain tenure of sickly beauty's "frail and feverish being"; and they hear not the "still small voice" of nature, which warns them to be women. Untried, and close concealed, the character fails in stamina and spontaneous power, as, from deficient exercise, the body wants symmetry and support, from the wiry fabric which has expanded unequally in the drawing-room; and when these fair ones are called upon to be wives and mothers, they are often found to be doubly wanting.'

---

Art. VII. *The Woman of Shunem*, a Dramatic Sketch; *Patmos*, a Fragment; and other Poems. By James Edmeston, Author of *Sacred Lyrics*, &c. fcap 8vo. pp. 124. Price 3s. 6d. London, 1829.

**T**HERE are some beautiful little poems in this volume. The Author has a genuine poetical vein, which, if not particularly deep, is of a pure ore, and will well repay the working. He has contributed to sacred poetry some hymns and devotional effusions displaying both originality and feeling; and the very inequality of his poems evinces the genuine nature of that poetic inspiration which occasionally beams and glows in his verse, and which he seems to obey, rather than to command. Of the longer poems in the present volume, we have little to say. To have attempted a dramatic sketch, and to have failed, may almost be termed the common lot of those who handle the lyre; and it betrays a lack of judgement, more than a want of genius. The lyrical and the dramatic gifts are seldom united; and what may appear a paradox, those who succeed best in a long poem, whether dramatic or narrative, rarely excel in a short one. Mr. Edmeston's '*Patmos*', entitled a Fragment, consists, in fact, of a series of short poems slenderly connected; it is consequently better than a long poem would have been on the same subject. But still, between this laboured essay and the delightful pieces appended to it, there is all the difference that there is between a flower and a trinket,—between the notes of a sky-lark, soaring as she sings, and those of a flageolet. The individual who can in his happiest moods produce such poems

as the following, does himself great injustice when he writes any thing worse. But how rarely does a man of genius calculate his powers aright!

‘ THE SHAME OF THE CROSS.

- ‘ Lord of my soul ! I take thy name,  
And bind the glory to my brow ;  
Exulting in my Master's shame,  
And proud his scandal to avow.
- ‘ True, neither flames nor racks appear,  
Chains bind the dragon to his den ;  
Yet is there venom in a sneer,  
And bitterness in scorn of men.
- ‘ The cross I wear not,—as 'tis worn,  
Gem-wrought, at feast and masquerade ;  
Nor on chivalric banners borne,  
That flame along the fierce crusade.
- ‘ These bear no shame in human eyes,—  
Pride claims such trophies for her own ;  
And 'tis the cross which men despise  
That is esteemed by God alone.
- ‘ A pure, meek spirit, humble heart,  
A soul of faith, and praise, and prayer ;  
At these the world will aim its dart,—  
And this the cross I fain would bear ! ’

In these stanzas, the sentiment transcends the poetry, yet the verse is not unworthy of what it encloses. In the next specimen we shall take, there is much poetical merit.

ITHURIEL.

- ‘ How soft is Night !—How fair the full moon glances  
O'er yon dark cavern'd cliff and bowery tree !  
How bright in many-rippled gold it dances  
On the calm bosom of that summer sea !
- ‘ No sound is stirring save the light wave plashing,  
As on the beach it sinks and falls away ;  
Or, o'er a rock, some playful billow dashing,  
Breaks into sparkling gem-drops all its spray.
- ‘ The boatman through the golden ocean gliding,  
Trills the gay song of pleasure and delight ;  
And in due cadence falls the oar, dividing  
His pathway in the field of lunar light.
- ‘ In the deep cave sits Solitude reposing,  
Beneath its lichen crown, on mossy seat ;

And Fancy there, her fairy gates unclosing,  
Leads heavenly visions through that still retreat.

‘ On such a night, when that soft moon was shining  
O’er lovelier scenes than Earth can boast to-day,  
The first of all mankind reposed, reclining  
Within a bower of sweets, now pass’d away.

‘ Eden’s fair rivers were serenely laving,  
The shadowy forests mingled palm and rose,  
And all was still, save where a life-tree waving,  
Ithuriel sat, and sang them to repose.

‘ Peace to your slumbers, favourites of Heaven !  
Light dreams enchant you, and sweet rest renew ;  
To us, the eldest born of God, is given  
Less honour than, the youngest born—to you !

‘ Though evil spirits all around are lurking,  
Sleep on—sleep on—you have no cause for fear ;  
Though your worst woe they gladly would be working,  
They will not dare to tempt my lightning spear.

‘ Thou who hast form’d for man this lower dwelling,  
And every varied hill and valley made ;  
So fair, that scarce their own bright heaven excelling,  
Angels might long to wander through this shade,—

‘ O let not Sin here stain a single feeling,  
Nor blight a single blossom of these bowers ;  
Forbid ! Forbid ! that Guilt their sorrow sealing,  
Should taint their race, as it has tainted ours.

‘ Here never be a rebel banner streaming,  
As in our glittering ranks we once beheld ;  
When the red lightning o’er the myriads gleaming,  
All the bright pomp of warrior-angels fell’d.

‘ Pure, pure as heaven, ere yet a single spirit  
Felt one unholy thought or wish arise,  
May this fair race, to endless years, inherit  
This earth of verdure, and these placid skies.

‘ Sleep on—sleep on—nor dread surrounding danger,  
Though evil forms around the garden stray ;  
Among these shades, full many a heavenly ranger,  
Arm’d for the battle, guards each opening way.

‘ Sweet sleep refresh you ! and when morning breaking,  
Lights up your bowers of fragrance with its rays,  
Oh may your spirits, with its light awaking,  
Ascend to heaven in matin-songs of praise !’

In that graceful and delicate species of poem, the sonnet,



Mr. Edmeston has been very successful. We must give insertion to two or three beautiful specimens.

‘ THE VIRGIN.

‘ Most blessed among women !—Vestal pure,  
And full of faith beyond thy twilight day !  
What joy didst thou possess, what pain endure,  
While thirty annual seasons pass'd away !  
Conceal'd within thine heart, unboasted, lay  
Secret imaginings, though veil'd, yet sure  
From that first hour the infant Saviour slept  
On thy young bosom in serene repose,  
Till the sword pierced thy soul, and thou hadst wept  
To view the torture of his short life's close.  
Doubtless thy constant hand oft sooth'd his woes,  
Doubtless thine eye a mother's watch oft kept :  
And thee he lov'd ; the last command he breath'd,  
Was, when to him most dear, thee, dying he bequeath'd !’

“ And the sea gave up the dead which were in it.”—*Rev.* xx. 13.

‘ TOMB'D in the deep sea, where the cavern'd rocks  
Form their sepulchral chamber—low and far,  
Sleep the drown'd dead—and mighty Ocean locks  
Their prison-vault with many a billowy bar :  
There, through the green light, fainter than a star,  
Gleams the bright king of the cerulean day ;  
There, as exulting o'er their human prey,  
The loud resounding waters madly jar :  
But vain their triumph !—for that mighty hand  
Which chains the wild waves in their bed of sand,  
Shall lead those prisoners from their rocky tomb ;  
And reunited love shall repossess  
A thousand-fold its first pure blessedness,  
Where amaranthine flowers in fields celestial bloom !’

We must make room for one more, as touching and beautiful in sentiment, as graceful in expression, reminding us of the style of our elder poets.

‘ How many denizens of heaven I know,  
Who once with me walk'd through this nether world,  
But now beside celestial rivers go,  
And golden streets enclos'd by gates empearl'd !  
Many whom I have lov'd, and love, are there ;  
And ah ! how few the scenes of vanish'd years,  
Save where in Memory's retrospect appears  
One, and another, now a seraph fair !  
It doubts me, whether those who yet remain  
To glad life's circle, be in number great  
As those I cannot hope to see again  
Till I may meet them in a deathless state :  
That land, whenever I its shores may see,  
Can scarcely seem a stranger's land to me !’

We know not by what accident, three stanzas appear at page 105, which are certainly not by Mr. Edmeston. Has his memory imposed upon him? They are taken from a poem by Mr. Conder.

- 
- Art. VIII. 1. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Holland*, occasioned by the Petition from the General Body of the Dissenting Ministers of London, for the Relief of the Roman Catholics. With Strictures on a Petition of an Opposite Nature, from some Dissenting Ministers; and Other Remarks, occasioned by Recent Circumstances. By a Member of the General Body. 8vo. pp. 40. London. 1829.
2. *The Christian Antidote to Unreasonable Fears at the present Crisis*. In Reply to the second printed Speech of the Rev. W. Thorp, against Catholic Emancipation. By John Leifchild. 8vo. pp. 48. London. 1829.
3. *Intolerance deprecated*. A Lecture, delivered at Zion Chapel, Frome. By Spedding Curwen. 8vo. pp. 42. London. 1829.

ALL pamphlets relating to what was termed the Catholic Question, will be, we suppose, henceforth considered as so much waste paper. Yet, a collection of the best papers and speeches that have been put forth upon the subject, would deserve a permanent place in our libraries. In addition to the noble specimens of parliamentary eloquence, which will be preserved in the records of the debate, the speeches of Drs. Chalmers and Thomson at the meeting of the Edinburgh Presbytery; the dignified, temperate, and argumentative letter of the Duke of Buckingham to the gentry, clergy, and freeholders of Buckinghamshire; and the letter to the Editor of the *Christian Observer* by the Rev. Daniel Wilson, M.A., Vicar of Islington\*; are worthy of being particularized, as meriting the perusal of every one, and not merely perusal, but preservation.

The Letter to Lord Holland is a valuable and interesting document. It has been called forth by the various representations which have been made, both in and out of parliament, respecting the conduct of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the metropolis; and contains a statement of the real circumstances connected with the Red-Cross Street petition, and that which, in defiance of common integrity, was put forth as a counter petition from Protestant Dissenting Ministers residing in and about London and Westminster. 'It is quite a comfort,' says the

---

\* Of this sensible and candid letter, a re-print has been circulated, price 1s. per dozen. It may still be useful in many quarters, in allaying feverish and fanatical alarms.

Writer, 'to be able to furnish the names of the subscribers to 'this document;' and for the honour and character of the Dissenting body, the list is printed. In the first place, it includes names of persons residing at Cambridge, Leeds, Gloucester, Bristol, and Cornwall. So much for the honesty of the designation affixed to the petition! In the next place, these Protestant Dissenting Ministers turn out to be, with few exceptions, men who were never heard of before in that character; lay-preachers, illiterate mechanics, the very sweepings of Dissenterism. Among the more notorious names, occur those of men distinguished by the Antinomian character of their preaching. To crown the whole business, the Petitioners avow that they 'were *not* parties to the petition for the repeal of the test and 'corporation acts;' thus glorying in their meritorious indifference to the purity of Divine ordinances, and the sacred cause of religious freedom; while they have the effrontery, further, to charge the Dissenting Ministers who subscribed the general petition, with becoming 'confederate with the Papists.' We feel grateful to the Author of this pamphlet, for having rescued the Dissenting Ministry from the disgrace inflicted upon it by this effusion of vulgar-minded bigotry.

Towards the conclusion of the pamphlet, the Writer adverts to a calumnious charge brought against the Protestant Dissenters from another quarter, as having been actuated by motives of hostility against the Establishment; and he repels it in terms of manly and dignified indignation.

'I know and assert on the best possible grounds, my lord, that the charge is false, and that the object of the dissenters in these petitions extends not beyond their specific prayer—that their aim in presenting their present supplication to the legislature is solely to promote the peace and security of the country, the good of the catholics, and the interests of the protestant religion itself. They are persuaded that its prosperity depends on the perfect freedom with which its principles may be advocated and opposed, propagated and resisted—that it has nothing to fear except from attempts to support it by unhallowed means—and that its glory will appear brightest when it shines forth in its own heavenly light. No church that is founded on its basis can be in any danger, or need experience any alarm. In proportion to the breadth and depth of its scriptural foundation is its security, and will be its durability. Confident I am, my lord, that whatever may be the opinions of the dissenters respecting the church of England, she has nothing to apprehend from any combined attempts or confederacy on their part against her interests.

'The dissenters, my lord, would scorn to conceal one object, by pretending zeal for the accomplishment of another. They will never attempt to gain by indirect and unfair means that which they would not openly avow to be their object. When the time shall come, if it ever come, that the destruction of the church of England shall be con-



templated by them, the attempt, whatever it may be, will be ascertained not by inference, but from intimations not liable to be misunderstood. I am, my lord, a dissenter by birth, by choice, and from principle; but I am neither a political nor an undermining dissenter. I cherish no personal or professional enmity to the church of England. I rejoice in all the good that is in it, and in all the good that has been done by it. I envy not its temporalities, nor could I enjoy them, were they within my reach. As a minister of Christ and the chosen pastor of a christian society, I am independent of any provision which the state could make for me, and enjoy a higher honour than any which it has in its power to bestow. The destruction of the church of England would therefore add nothing to my secular interests, and can present no field to my ambition. I devoutly pray that the lives and doctrine of her prelates may be pure as the lawn which adorns them; that her clergy may be the active and successful ministers of righteousness, and that all her members may be heirs of the kingdom of heaven. In the expression of these sentiments and feelings, my lord, I am confident I do not speak for myself alone; but that I express the views and wishes of the body of the protestant dissenters, and of the dissenting ministers of England.' pp. 37—39.

Mr. Leifchild has done himself honour by the truly Christian antidote which he has provided to the fanatical excitation produced in his immediate neighbourhood by a reverend alarmist, whose vehement eloquence is not always employed on the side of wisdom and righteousness, and who, on the occasion referred to, appears to have been carried away far beyond the bounds of sobriety or loyalty. We transcribe with pleasure the following just sentiments from this spirited and sensible reply.

'The cause of protestantism not only has nothing to fear from the meditated concession, but every thing to hope from the rejection of those weapons which are alien to her nature, which her ablest advocates have long since abjured, and which dissenters, above all others, have so generally and loudly proclaimed to be hostile to her triumphs. Has not this cause uniformly advanced most securely and successfully, when it has been sustained only by its own pure and celestial efficacy? Has not popery been kept vigorous and hostile in these realms,—has it not been made alarming in its present growth and attitude, *exclusively* by the remains of the bigoted and persecuting spirit of our established protestantism? Have we not ourselves condensed the combustible spirit into a high and dangerous degree of power by the very means employed to repress it,—when, had it been left perfectly free, it would have evaporated innocuously, or been purified by the accession of a more healthful air, with which it might have commingled, and in which it would have disappeared? I advocate these concessions, then, because I am a christian, and durst not persecute any man even to the deprivation of a shoe-latchet for his religion. I advocate them because I am a dissenter, and consistency requires me to concede to all others what I claim for myself as a good citizen and loyal subject. I advocate them because I abhor popery, whether I find it in

catholics or protestants, and because I love pure, consistent protestantism, and wish to see it triumph—which I feel assured it never can do, till it has despoiled popery of the only remaining argument it possesses against protestants, and till it shall resign the exclusive honour of being intolerant to those with whose religion it comports, and whose cause cannot command better weapons.

‘But if the adherents of popery derive no accession of argument to their religion from the expected measure of concession, still less is it likely to contribute to their ardour in its propagation, or their desire to meddle with the government by whom it is no longer coerced, since the only reasons by which they could be made unfriendly to that government, the only reasons for which they could dislike it, and seek its overthrow, will be abolished. They may continue to dislike our religion, they may freely express their hatred of our common protestantism—this they can do now—but they will have no fair ground to arraign our civil polity—they will be despoiled of all pretext to move against it the discontented and the disloyal. It will rob their quiver of every arrow for this warfare, and place them in a state of the fullest and fairest equality with their religious adversaries.’ pp. 24—26.

‘But our religion, it is said, will thus suffer a great advantage to be given to her rival, by affording her the highest facility for the furtherance of her aspiring wishes. The catholics, emboldened by this show of favour, will prefer new claims; they will eagerly employ the power acquired, in disseminating their faith; will make many new converts, and may possibly change the face of the country. I will not say that popery is not aspiring; that it may not even increase in political importance; or that with its increase it will ever cease to be intolerant. I can look at the *thing* with as little complacency, with as little belief of its melioration, as any of the foes to concession. I do not sympathize in the alarm of Mr. Thorp, neither do I symbolize with those of its eulogists who represent it as now entirely dispossessed of the evil spirit—if ever it were moved by one. I believe the *system* has undergone no process of exorcism. It is now what the Council of Trent decreed it. And let no one say, that I am less decided in my abhorrence of all and every part of it, than my reverend brother. I will stand second to no man in my resistance of *popery*. Should the brunt of controversy come, I will take my place in the front of danger; but I will gird myself only in the armour of truth, and wield no sword but that of the spirit. The rights of the men, however, are not the rights of the system. Here let every man make a clear distinction; he may hate the system with a perfect hatred—he may treat it with unmeasured scorn—he may curse it in the name of the Lord; but let him treat the men as men, as brethren, and fellow-citizens, and call them to his bar only when they have violated the terms of the social compact. Popery I wish to see exterminated, but papists I must treat as if I wished them to be saved from the errors of their system, without subjecting them to any of their own purgatorian fires. Let it then be distinctly understood, I do not concede to Mr. Thorp the honour of more intensely hating popery than myself, nor the credit of being more thoroughly sensible of its deformity and malignity. I am the advocate neither of its gross errors, its impious abominations, nor its bitter

and relentless spirit of persecution. It may learn a lesson for its good behaviour from the prejudices so prevalent against it, which would suspend even the free operation of the principles of equity and liberty on its account. These are honest prejudices, and but too well justified by its past history and character, though now wrought upon and misrepresented for sinister purposes. But what advantage will this meditated measure confer on the catholic religion, that will not be more than counterbalanced by the full and free operation it will allow to the arguments for the protestant faith? Though the boon afforded may not, especially at first, be extensively beneficial to them, yet as the want of it was felt to be an indignity, a galling chain around their neck, the wearing of which, however, did not altogether prevent them from listening to our religious appeals, and from being, in not a few instances, induced by them to change their creed, surely those arguments will not be the less attended to, or the less likely to exert their legitimate influence, when we meet them as fellow citizens, and without any ostensible ground on their part for distrust and complaint.

pp. 30—32.

Mr. Curwen thus concludes his forcible appeal to the humanity, the consistency, the Christian principles of his hearers.

‘ We are all assured of the final triumphs of divine truth ; but in order to the achievement of that triumph, sometimes the breaker must go before the onset ; and the loyalty of that moral dominion needs to be marshalled into systematic hostility and systematic movements against “ the man of sin.” You are forbidden to attack him with the force of coercion. The sword and the bow and the battle, are not the engines by which you are to destroy the refuge of his ignorance and his vice. No, your weapon is truth, the sword that goes out of the mouth ; and your artillery is made of arguments :—But to these at present the Irish Catholics are invulnerable ; they retire at your approach. They fall back into a consolidated phalanx, and hold your influence at defiance. They are afraid of you. They suspect your motive. They cannot be persuaded to think that the law of kindness dwells beneath your tongue, while unreasonable and cruel enactments are not blotted from your statute-book. It requires a miracle to convert Ireland to the faith of Protestants while civil restrictions deny them the rights of men. Remove these restrictions, and you will seem to be kind : your goodness alone can lead them to repentance.

‘ When once you have obtained their confidence in your sincerity and secured your entrance to their reason and their conscience ;—when once such a door “ wide and effectual ” is opened to you,—then you can proceed to your glorious enterprise ; and then, of the evangelists of nations it shall be said, even in reference to this land of rebellion and conflict ; “ His reward is with him and his work before him.” ’

‘ The enterprise of the Hibernian and Irish Evangelical Societies is a most glorious one, and we rejoice in the removal of civil disabilities on all accounts, but chiefly, as it will tend in no small degree to accelerate the march of those institutions, and contribute to the achievement of their triumphs. Then the soul of Ireland shall be emancipated ; the native majesty of her high spirit, moved with contempt for



the images of her superstitions, shall break them to pieces with her own hands ; and her heart, that alternately bled with sorrow and burned with revenge, shall become the seat of affection, of contentment and joy. The cross, and no longer the crucifix, shall be the theme of her gratitude and the hope of her redemption ;—the cross of that glorious Mediator, whose benevolence regards all mankind as but one family of orphans,—whom he pitied, over whom he wept, for whom he bled ; and whose errand from the bosom of his Father, it was, to hush their tumults, to wipe away their tears, to reconcile each to the other, and all of them to God.' pp. 39—42.

## NOTICES.

- Art. IX. 1. *A Help to the Private and Domestic Reading of the Holy Scriptures* : including several Essays in Relation to the Scriptures ; an Arrangement of the Books of the Old and New Testament in Chronological Order ; An Analysis of Mr. Mede's Scheme of the Apocalypse ; and an Explanatory Index of Various Matters contained in the Bible. By J. Leifchild. 12mo. pp. 132. Price 2s. 6d. London. Nisbet.
2. *The Scripture Student's Assistant* ; being a complete Index and concise Dictionary to the Holy Bible : in which the various Persons, Places, and Subjects mentioned in it are accurately referred to ; and every difficult Word briefly explained. Designed to facilitate the Consultation and Study of the Sacred Scriptures. By the Rev. John Barr, Author of Plain Catechetical Instructions on Baptism and the Lord's Supper. 12mo. pp. 178. Price 3s. 6d. Glasgow, 1829.

THE demand for helps of this description, is a pleasing indication of the increased attention paid to the reading of the Holy Scriptures ; and our warmest approbation is due to every attempt to present in a compressed and popular form, the auxiliary information which is requisite to their being adequately understood. Mr. Leifchild has contrived to furnish, within the compass of a few pages, a vast portion of multifarious details, historical, chronological, etymological, and didactic. We must regret, however, the extreme brevity to which he has found it necessary to confine himself ; as it has led him to crowd his matter too much, and to run various distinct topics together. Many of the sentences read too much like mere hints or heads, requiring to be expanded by a living teacher. Some of the statements, too, are of a controverted and doubtful character, and ought not, we think, to find a place in such a summary. We may refer, for instance, to several of the remarks which occur in the Account of the Collection of the sacred books of the Old Testament, and to the Explanations of the prophetic symbols. The Epitome of the Life of Christ is also open to exception. That Our Lord had ' not a literary, but a religious education ', as well as some of the statements which follow, is an assertion of questionable

propriety. The Concluding Remarks upon the Style of the New Testament writers, are much too summary and imperfect. These criticisms will be thought minute; but, in proportion to the value and usefulness of such works, ought to be the pains bestowed upon their compilation, and the severity with which they are scrutinized.

Mr. Barr's Dictionary to the Holy Bible, is intended to serve at once as a Glossary and an Index. A very great number of words have on this account been admitted into it, which require no other explanation than is supplied by a common Dictionary. These might evidently have been multiplied *ad libitum*: e. g. Intermeddle, Intrude, Invade, Invisible, Irony, Superfluous, Visit, Voluntary, &c. He has also introduced, in many instances, etymologies alike doubtful and useless. That Chloe means 'green herb', and Julia 'soft hair', can really throw no light upon the Scriptures; nor can it be necessary to inform the student, that 'cucumber is a plant, the fruit of which is fleshy like an 'apple', or that 'goldsmith is one who makes golden wares'. The 'Asia' of Scripture is *not* 'one of the quarters of the earth'; nor is Armenia 'a province of Asia'. 'Devils' are not spoken of in Scripture, although demons are. Tabor was certainly not the 'mount of transfiguration'. 'Kiss', ought to have been explained as a mark of homage and fealty. We hope that Mr. Barr will take these suggestions in good part, as our object in offering them, is the same that he has had in compiling his volume, which, notwithstanding these faults of redundancy, and some instances of incorrectness, we can cordially recommend.

---

Art. X. *Observations on Early Rising, and on Early Prayer, as a Means of Happiness, and as an Incentive to Devotion.* By Henry Erskine Head, A.M. Foolscap 8vo. pp. 190. London, 1828.

THE faults of this little volume are, want of precision and a tendency to wordiness; its better qualities, a large proportion of seasonable admonition, an occasional display of eloquent writing, and a series of interesting extracts from valuable authors,—Jeremy Taylor, Hooker, Law, Locke, and Tillotson.

---

## ART. XI. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

In the Press, *Beatrice, a Tale founded on Facts.* By Mrs. Hoffland. 3 Vol. 12mo.

In the Press, *Memoir of Mrs. Ann Judson, wife of the Rev. Adoniram Judson, Missionary to Burmah; including an account of the Commencement and Progress of the American Baptist Mission in that Empire.* By James D. Knowles, Pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Boston, Massachusetts.

In the Press, the *Family Chaplain, or St. Mark's Gospel analysed and prepared for Reading and Expounding to a Family Circle.* By Rev. S. Hinds, M.A. Vice-principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford.

The Rev. J. H. Hinton, of Reading, is preparing for Publication, a *Treatise on the Nature and Necessity of the Influence of the Holy Spirit.*

## ART. XII. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Tales of Field and Flood, with Sketches of Life at Home. By John Malcolm, Author of "Scenes of War," "Reminiscences of a Campaign in the Pyrenees and South of France," &c. &c. Small 8vo.

Biographical Sketches and Authentic Anecdotes of Dogs, exhibiting remarkable Instances of the Instinct, Sagacity, and social Disposition of this faithful Animal: Illustrated by Representations of the most striking varieties, and by correct Portraits of celebrated or remarkable Dogs, from Drawings chiefly Original. Also, a Historical Introduction; and a copious Appendix on the Breeding, Feeding, Training, Diseases, and Medical Treatment of Dogs; together with a Treatise on the Game-Laws of Great Britain. By Captain Thomas Brown, F.R.S.E., &c. Royal 18mo.

## NATURAL HISTORY.

Elements of Natural History, or an Introduction to Systematic Zoology, chiefly according to the Classification of Linnaeus; with Illustrations of every Order. By John Howard Hinton, A.M. 4to. 5s.

## THEOLOGY.

Sermons, chiefly Practical. By the Rev. Edward Bather, M.A. Archdeacon of Salop, in the Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry; and Vicar of Meole Brace, Salop. Vol. the Second, 12s. Also, the second Edition of Vol. I. 8vo. 12s.

To the Irreligious. By J. H. Hinton, A.M. 2d. or 14s. per 100.

Explanatory and Practical Comments; being a series of Short Lectures upon the New Testament: designed as an Assistant in Family Worship, and suited to the capacity of all Ranks. By a Clergyman of

the Established Church. Vol. I. The Gospels and Acts. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The Natural History of Enthusiasm. In ten Sections.—

Section I. Enthusiasm, Secular and Religious.—II. Enthusiasm in Devotion.—III. Enthusiastic Perversion of the Doctrine of Divine Influence.—IV. Enthusiasm the Source of Heresy.—V. Enthusiasm of Prophetic Interpretation.—VI. Enthusiastic Abuses of the Doctrine of a Particular Providence.—VII. Enthusiasm of Philanthropy.—VIII. Sketch of the Enthusiasm of the Ancient Church.—IX. The same subject—Ingredients of the Ancient Monachism.—X. Hints on the Probable Spread of Christianity, submitted to those who misuse the term, Enthusiasm. 8vo. 8s.

Secker's Non-such Professor in his Meridian Splendour. To which is added, The Wedding Ring, a Sermon. A new Edition, revised by the late Matthew Wilks. 18mo. 3s.

Forty-five Lectures on our Lord's Sermon on the Mount. By J. E. Good, Salisbury. 8vo. 14s.

A Funeral Sermon delivered in the parish Church of Lavenham, A.D. 1679, on the occasion of the death of the Rev. Wm. Gurnall, A.M. By the Rev. W. Burkitt, Author of the Commentary on the New Testament. To which is prefixed, an Advertisement containing what further information can now be obtained respecting Gurnall. By the Rev. Robert Ainslie. 8vo. 1s.

Sermons. By the Rev. J. Jones, M.A. Minister of St. Andrew's Church, Liverpool. 8vo.

Intolerance Deprecated. A Lecture delivered in Zion Chapel, Frome, on Thursday, 12th March, 1829. By Spedding Curwen. 8vo. 1s.

\*.\* Our Subscribers are requested to excuse the deficiency of a half-sheet in the present Number, which will be supplied in our next.